arXiv:0709.1072v2 [gr-qc] 17 Dec 2007

Total angular momentum from Dirac eigenspinors

László B Szabados
Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics
H-1525 Budapest 114, P. O. Box 49, Hungary
e-mail: lbszab@rmki.kfki.hu

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The eigenvalue problem for Dirac operators, constructed from two connections on the spinor bundle over closed spacelike 2-surfaces, is investigated. A class of divergence free vector fields, built from the eigenspinors, are found, which, for the lowest eigenvalue, reproduce the rotation Killing vectors of metric spheres, and provide rotation BMS vector fields at future null infinity. This makes it possible to introduce a well defined, gauge invariant spatial angular momentum at null infinity, which reduces to the standard expression in stationary spacetimes. The general formula for the angular momentum flux carried away be the gravitational radiation is also derived.

1 Introduction

Angular momentum is one of the basic conserved quantities in physics, and in general relativity there is, indeed, a well defined notion of total (ADM) angular momentum of an isolated system 'measured' at *spatial infinity.* On the other hand, if we are interested in the angular momentum carried away by the gravitational radiation, then we should be able to define total angular momentum at future *null infinity*, too. Unfortunately, however, there is no generally accepted notion of angular momentum at null infinity of a radiative spacetime. (For a review of classical results see [1], and for the recent ones see e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7].) Another difficulty is that even if we have an ambiguity-free notion of angular momentum, it is not guaranteed that the angular momenta measured at *different* retarded times (i.e. when they are associated with *different* cuts of future null infinity) can be compared, and hence there is no unambiguous way of computing the angular momentum radiated away in a given time interval by the localized source (see e.g. [1, 6]).

The situation at the quasi-local level (i.e. when we are considering only subsystems of the whole universe, or, mathematically, we intend to associate physical quantities with closed spacelike 2-surfaces $\mathcal{S}$) is even worse, because we do not have even the asymptotic (BMS) symmetries. The best that we can do is to try to systematically 'quasi-localize' the canonical analysis of GR. Although this program is not yet completed, the first few steps towards the quasi-local canonical GR have been made [8], yielding a class of well defined, 2+2 covariant, gauge invariant observables $O[N^a]$. These are based on divergence free vector fields N^a that are tangent to the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$. Unfortunately, however, without additional restriction on the vector fields these observables reflect properties of the 2-surface as a submanifold in the spacetime, rather than the properties of the gravitational 'field' itself: $O[N^a]$ may be non-zero for 2-surfaces even in Minkowski spacetime. Thus to obtain physically interesting observables in the form of $O[N^a]$, new ideas are needed how to choose the vector fields N^a.

On the other hand, and remarkably enough, the requirement of the finiteness of $O[N^a]$ at spatial infinity of asymptotically flat spacetimes already restricts the asymptotic structure of N^a such that the corresponding observable will be just the familiar spatial (ADM) angular momentum. Similarly, at future null infinity of a *stationary* asymptotically flat spacetime $O[N^a]$ reproduces the standard angular momentum expression. Nevertheless, in radiative spacetimes at future null infinity $O[N^a]$ is still ambiguous. Thus to obtain a well-defined notion of angular momentum at future null infinity a more detailed prescription of the divergence-free vector fields should be given.

A potentially viable construction might be based on the recent idea of approximate Killing vectors on topological 2-spheres [9]. These are the divergence-free vector fields that solve a variational problem, whose action is built form the norm of the Killing operator. Since these vector fields are divergence free by construction, they can be used in $O[N^a]$ to get well-defined, gauge invariant observables.

Another promising approach of constructing such observables could be based on the spectral analysis of the Laplace, or of the Dirac operators on closed spacelike 2-surfaces. Clearly, the eigenvalues of these operators are gauge invariant, and they should reflect, maybe in a rather implicit way, the geometrical properties of the surface. (For example, the mass and angular momentum parameters can be recovered from the eigenvalues of the Laplacian on the event horizon of a Kerr–Newman black hole [10].) Indeed, in Riemannian geometry mathematicians already proved the existence of sharp lower bounds to the first eigenvalue of the Dirac operator in terms of the scalar curvature [11, 12, 13, 14] or the volume [15, 14, 16]. Similar results exist for hypersurface Dirac operators when the lower bounds are given in terms of the curvature of the intrinsic geometry and the extrinsic curvature [17].

In the present paper we also investigate the eigenvalue problem of the Dirac operators. However, instead of the eigenvalues, we concentrate on the (almost always) overlooked eigenspinors. A further difference between the former and the present investigations is that the base manifold on which the Dirac operators are defined is not simply a two-dimensional Riemannian manifold, but a spacelike 2-surface in a general Lorentzian spacetime. Moreover, the two Dirac operators that we study here are built from both the intrinsic and extrinsic geometrical objects of the surface. This yields a number of conceptual difficulties (e.g. no natural constant Hermitian metric exists on the spinor bundle), and hence we can define the eigenvalue problem only for the spacetime (rather than the 2-surface) Dirac spinors. Moreover, in lack of any natural Hermitian metric the reality of the eigenvalues is not guaranteed. Nevertheless, we show how the Nester–Witten integral can be used to give criteria for the reality of the eigenvalues. We construct three divergence-free vector fields from the eigenspinors. In particular, we show that on round spheres with radius r two of these vector fields, built from the eigenspinors with the lowest eigenvalue of one of the two Dirac operators, are proportional to the $1/r$ times, and the third to the $1/r^2$ times the rotation Killing vectors of the metric sphere.

Based on this observation we show that on the large spheres $u =$ const, $r =$ const in a Bondi type coordinate system near the future null infinity in an asymptotically flat spacetime the divergence-free vector fields analogous to the first two above determine the rotation BMS vector fields tangent to the cut $u =$ const of $\mathscr{I}^+$. As we already mentioned, we expect that the gravitational energy-momentum and angular momentum be connected with the Hamiltonian formulation of Einstein's theory, i.e. these observables are expected to be the value of the correct Hamiltonian of the theory with appropriately chosen generators. Thus it seems natural to define the angular momentum at the future null infinity by the observable $O[N^a]$ in which the vector fields N^a are chosen to be the divergence-free vector fields built from the eigenspinors with the lowest eigenvalue of the Dirac operator. This strategy gives two observables: the first can be interpreted as spatial angular momentum. This is gauge invariant, free of ambiguities, and trivially reduces to the standard expressions in the stationary and in the axi-symmetric spacetimes. Moreover, there is a natural way of comparing the angular momentum measured at different retarded times, and hence we can compute the angular momentum flux carried away by the gravitational radiation. The other observable is a non-negative expression of the magnetic part of the asymptotic shear, and it is vanishing precisely when the shear is purely electric. Since the shear is known to be purely electric in stationary spacetimes, this is a measure of dynamics of the gravitational 'field' near the future null infinity. Its significance is, however, not yet clear. Remarkably enough, though the two BMS vector fields are different, they define the same pair of observables.

The organization of the paper follows the logic of the results above: in the second section we recall the basic notions, discuss the general aspects of the eigenvalue problem for the Dirac operator that is based on a Sen-type derivative operator, construct the divergence-free vector fields and discuss the reality properties of the eigenvalues. Section 3 is devoted to the discussion of the special properties of another Dirac operator, which is a reduction of the previous one and is built only from the intrinsic geometry and the connection 1-form of the normal bundle of the 2-surface. The related non-existence result for the *constant* positive definite Hermitian scalar product in given in the appendix. Then, in section 4, we apply these ideas to round spheres, where we calculate the spectrum of the Dirac operators and construct the divergence-free vector fields explicitly. Section 5 is devoted to the analogous calculations on large spheres near the future null infinity in asymptotically flat spacetimes. We also calculate the corresponding angular momentum and angular momentum flux as well.

The signature of g_{ab} is $(+,-,-,-)$, the curvature and Ricci tensors and the curvature scalar are defined by $R^a{}_{bcd}X^b := -(\nabla_c\nabla_d - \nabla_d\nabla_c)X^a$, $R_{bd} := R^a{}_{bad}$ and $R := R_{ab}g^{ab}$, respectively. Then Einstein's equations take the form $G_{ab} = -8\pi G T_{ab}$, where G is Newton's gravitational constant.

2 The $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator

2.1 Generalities

Let $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$ denote the bundle of 2-component (i.e. Weyl) spinors over the closed, orientable spacelike 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ in the space and time orientable spacetime, and we denote the complex conjugate bundle by $\bar{\mathbb{S}}^{A'}(\mathcal{S})$. From the spacetime structure two metrics are inherited: the symplectic ε_{AB} and the symmetric γ_{AB}. The former is just the spinor form of the spacetime metric, $g_{ab} = \varepsilon_{AB}\varepsilon_{A'B'}$, while the latter is built from the timelike and spacelike unit normals of $\mathcal{S}$, $t^{AA'}$ and $v^{AA'}$, respectively, as $\gamma^A{}_B := 2t^{AA'}v_{BA'}$. These normals define the projection $\Pi^a_b := \delta^a_b - t^a t_b + v^a v_b$ to the 2-surface, by means of which the restriction to $\mathcal{S}$ of the spacetime tangent bundle decomposes in a unique way to the g_{ab}-orthogonal direct sum of the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{S}$ and the normal bundle $N\mathcal{S}$. Though the actual normals t^a and v^a are not uniquely determined, both the projection Π^a_b and the spinor $\gamma^A{}_B$ are well defined. This $\gamma^A{}_B$ defines a chirality on the spinor bundle $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$. Thus the spinor bundle is endowed in a natural way by the symplectic metric and the chirality, and in this case the elements of $(\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S}), \varepsilon_{AB}, \gamma^A{}_B)$ are called 2-surface spinors.

On the spinor bundle, two connections can be introduced in a natural way, and the corresponding derivative operators will be denoted by δ_e and Δ_e, respectively. The first is built from the intrinsic 2-metric and the connection 1-form $A_e := \Pi^f_e(\nabla_f t_a)v^a$ on the normal bundle of $\mathcal{S}$, while the other contains the spinor form $Q^A{}_{eB}$ of the extrinsic curvature tensor $Q^a{}_{eb}$ of $\mathcal{S}$ too, where $Q^A{}_{eB} = \frac{1}{2}\Pi^f_e(\nabla_f\gamma^A{}_E)\gamma^E{}_B$. This $Q^A{}_{EE'B}$ has the reality property $Q^A{}_{AE'B} = \bar{Q}^{A'}{}_{A'BE'}$, expressing the hypersurface orthogonality of the two null normals of $\mathcal{S}$ (or, in other words, the reality of the two individual convergences ρ and ρ' corresponding to the outgoing and incoming null normals, respectively). The action of the covariant derivative Δ_e is given explicitly by $\Delta_e\lambda^A = \delta_e\lambda^A + Q^A{}_{eB}\lambda^B$. This is nothing but the projection to $\mathcal{S}$ of the spacetime Levi-Civita covariant derivative: $\Delta_a := \Pi^b_a\nabla_b$. Both Δ_e and δ_e annihilate ε_{AB}, but γ_{AB} is annihilated only by δ_e. The curvatures $f^A{}_{Bcd}$ and $F^A{}_{Bcd}$ corresponding to δ_e and Δ_e, respectively, are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
f^A{}_{Bcd} &= -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{4} f \gamma^A{}_B \varepsilon_{cd}, && (2.1)\\
F^A{}_{Bcd} &= f^A{}_{Bcd} - \bigl(\delta_c Q^A{}_{dB} - \delta_d Q^A{}_{cB} + Q^A{}_{cE} Q^E{}_{dB} - Q^A{}_{dE} Q^E{}_{cB}\bigr); && (2.2)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $f := f_{abcd}\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon^{ab} - \mathrm{i}{}^\perp\varepsilon^{ab})\varepsilon^{cd} = R - 2\mathrm{i}\varepsilon^{ab}\delta_a A_b$, the "scalar curvature" of the curvature $f^a{}_{bcd}$ of the derivative δ_e on the Lorentzian vector bundle over $\mathcal{S}$. Here R is the scalar curvature of the intrinsic geometry of $\mathcal{S}$, and ε_{ab} and ${}^\perp\varepsilon_{ab}$ are the volume 2-forms on the tangent and normal 2-spaces of $\mathcal{S}$, respectively. (For the details see [18, 5].)

The $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator on $\mathcal{S}$ is defined in the decomposition of $\Delta_{A'A}\lambda_B$ in its unprimed indices to its anti-symmetric and γ_{AB}-trace-free symmetric parts: The former, $\Delta_{A'A}\lambda^A$, gives the Dirac operator, while the latter the 2-surface twistor operator of Penrose. (The γ_{AB} trace gives essentially the Dirac operator too: $\gamma^{AB}\Delta_{A'A}\lambda_B = \bar\gamma_{A'}{}^{B'}\Delta_{B'B}\lambda^B$.) The square of the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta_e\Delta^e\lambda_A - \varepsilon^{A'B'}\varepsilon^{BC}Q_{e[ab]}\Delta^e\lambda_C -{}&\\
-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{A'B'}\varepsilon^{BC}F_{CDAA'BB'}\lambda^D.& \qquad (2.3)
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking into account (2.1)-(2.2) and that the anti-symmetric part of the extrinsic curvature tensor is $2Q_{e[ab]} = -(\varepsilon_{A'B'}Q_{AEE'B} + \varepsilon_{AB}\bar Q_{A'EE'B'})$, we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
-2\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B = \Delta_e\Delta^e\lambda_A + \frac{1}{4}f\lambda_A - 2Q_{AeB}\Delta^e\lambda^B -{}&\\
-\varepsilon^{A'B'}\Bigl(\delta_{AA'}Q^B{}_{BB'C} - \delta_{BB'}Q^B{}_{AA'C} +{}&\\
+ Q^B{}_{AA'E}Q^E{}_{BB'C} - Q^B{}_{BB'E}Q^E{}_{AA'C}\Bigr)\lambda^C.& \qquad (2.4)
\end{aligned}
$$

This equation is analogous to the Lichnerowicz identity [19]: the square of the Dirac operator is expressed in terms of the Laplacian and the curvature, but here $\Delta_e\Delta^e$ is not the intrinsic Laplacian and the first derivative of the spinor field also appears on the right.

An analogous analysis can be carried out with the $\delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator too, but all the results can be recovered from those for the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator by the formal substitution $Q^A{}_{eB} = 0$ too. In particular, the identity (2.4) reduces to

$$
-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B = \delta_e\delta^e\lambda_A + \frac{1}{4}f\lambda_A. \qquad (2.5)
$$

Note that, strictly speaking, this is still not the Lichnerowicz identity, because $\delta_{AA'}$ is *not* only an intrinsic derivative operator: it contains extrinsic quantities in the form of A_e as well, while the Dirac operator in the genuine Lichnerowicz identity is built exclusively from the intrinsic geometry of $\mathcal{S}$.

2.2 The eigenvalue problem for the 2-surface Dirac operators

If we had a naturally defined Hermitian metric $G_{AA'}$ on $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$ by means of which the bundles $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$ and $\bar{\mathbb{S}}^{A'}(\mathcal{S})$ could be identified (i.e. the primed indices could be converted to unprimed ones), then the eigenvalue equation for the $\delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator could be defined as

$$\mathrm{i}G_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B=-\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_A. \tag{2.6}$$

(The choice for the apparently ad hoc coefficient $-1/\sqrt{2}$ in front of the eigenvalue α yields the compatibility both with the subsequent more general analysis and the known standard results in special cases.) However, it is desirable that, in addition, such a Hermitian metric be compatible with the connection in the sense that $\delta_e G_{AA'}=0$. Nevertheless, in the appendix we show that the existence of such a Hermitian metric is equivalent to the vanishing of the holonomy of δ_e on the normal bundle (and, in particular, its curvature, $\mathrm{Im}\, f$, must be zero). Therefore, on a general 2-surface in a general, curved spacetime we do not have any such natural Hermitian structure on $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$. Thus to motivate how the eigenvalue problem should be defined for the $\delta_{AA'}$ (or, more generally, for the $\Delta_{AA'}$)-Dirac operator, let us consider the eigenvalue problem for the spacetime Dirac (rather than the Weyl) spinors, where the primed and unprimed indices are treated on equal footing.

Recall that a Dirac spinor Ψ^α is a pair of Weyl spinors λ^A and $\bar{\mu}^{A'}$, written them as a column vector

$$\Psi^\alpha=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda^A\\ \bar{\mu}^{A'}\end{pmatrix} \tag{2.7}$$

and adopting the convention $\alpha=A\oplus A'$, $\beta=B\oplus B'$ etc. Its derivative $\Delta_e\Psi^\alpha$ is the column vector consisting of $\Delta_e\lambda^A$ and $\Delta_e\bar{\mu}^{A'}$. If Dirac's γ-'matrices' are denoted by $\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}$, then one can consider the eigenvalue problem

$$\mathrm{i}\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\Delta^e\Psi^\beta=\alpha\Psi^\alpha. \tag{2.8}$$

Explicitly, with the representation

$$\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}=\sqrt{2}\begin{pmatrix}0 & \varepsilon_{E'B'}\delta^A_E\\ \varepsilon_{EB}\delta^{A'}_{E'} & 0\end{pmatrix} \tag{2.9}$$

(see e.g. [20], pp 221), this is just the pair of equations

$$\mathrm{i}\Delta_{A'}{}^A\lambda_A=-\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{\mu}_{A'}, \qquad \mathrm{i}\Delta_A{}^{A'}\bar{\mu}_{A'}=-\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_A. \tag{2.10}$$

By (2.10) $\Psi^\alpha=(\lambda^A,\bar{\mu}^{A'})$ (as a column vector) is a Dirac eigenspinor with eigenvalue α precisely when $(\lambda^A,-\bar{\mu}^{A'})$ is a Dirac eigenspinor with eigenvalue $-\alpha$. In the language of Dirac spinors this is formulated in terms of the chirality, represented by the so-called 'γ_5-matrix', denoted here by

$$\eta^\alpha{}_\beta := \frac{1}{4!}\varepsilon^{abcd}\gamma^\alpha_{a\mu}\gamma^\mu_{b\nu}\gamma^\nu_{c\rho}\gamma^\rho_{d\beta} = \mathrm{i}\begin{pmatrix} \delta^A_B & 0 \\ 0 & -\delta^{A'}_{B'} \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.11}$$

(see appendix II. of [6]). Since this is anti-commuting with $\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}$, from (2.8) we obtain that $\mathrm{i}\gamma^\alpha_{e\mu}\Delta^e(\eta^\mu{}_\beta\Psi^\beta) = -\alpha(\eta^\alpha{}_\beta\Psi^\beta)$. Thus if Ψ^α is a Dirac eigenspinor with eigenvalue α, then, in fact, $\eta^\alpha{}_\beta\Psi^\beta$ is a Dirac eigenspinor with eigenvalue $-\alpha$.

On the other hand, the Dirac eigenspinors with definite chirality belong to the kernel of the Dirac operator. Indeed, Dirac spinors with definite chirality have the structure either $(\lambda^A, 0)$ or $(0, \bar\mu^{A'})$, which, by (2.10), yield that $\Delta_{A'A}\lambda^A = 0$ or $\Delta_{AA'}\bar\mu^{A'} = 0$, respectively. Therefore, this notion of chirality cannot be used to decompose the space of the eigenspinors with given eigenvalue. Its role is simply to take a Dirac eigenspinor with eigenvalue α to a Dirac eigenspinor with eigenvalue $-\alpha$.

The equations of (2.10) imply that

$$-\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B = \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\lambda_A, \qquad -\Delta_{A'}{}^A\Delta_A{}^{B'}\bar\mu_{B'} = \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\bar\mu_{A'}. \tag{2.12}$$

Thus if $\Psi^\alpha = (\lambda^A, \bar\mu^{A'})$ is a Dirac eigenspinor with eigenvalue α, then its Weyl spinor parts λ_A and $\bar\mu_{A'}$ are eigenspinors of the *second order* operator $-2\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$ and $-2\Delta_{A'}{}^A\Delta_A{}^{B'}$, respectively, with the *same* eigenvalue α^2. Conversely, if λ_A is a Weyl eigenspinor of $-2\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$ with non-zero eigenvalue α^2, then $\Psi^\alpha_\pm$, built from λ^A and $\bar\mu^{A'} := \mp(\sqrt{2}/\alpha)\mathrm{i}\Delta^{A'A}\lambda_A$, are Dirac eigenspinors with eigenvalue $\pm\alpha$, respectively, for which $\eta^\alpha{}_\beta\Psi^\beta_\pm = \mathrm{i}\Psi^\alpha_\mp$. Therefore, *there is a natural isomorphism between the space* $\mathbf{W}_{\alpha^2}$ *of the Weyl eigenspinors of* $-2\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$ *with eigenvalue* α^2 *and the direct sum* $\mathbf{D}_\alpha \oplus \mathbf{D}_{-\alpha}$*, where* $\mathbf{D}_\alpha$ *is the space of the Dirac eigenspinors of* Δ_e *with eigenvalue* α*. The chirality operator* $\eta^\alpha{}_\beta$ *maps* $\mathbf{D}_{\pm\alpha}$ *to* $\mathbf{D}_{\mp\alpha}$. For zero eigenvalue, $\alpha = 0$, the Weyl eigenspinors define the kernel of the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator, which, apart from exceptional 2-surfaces, is empty (see e.g. [18, 2]). Thus for generic 2-surfaces, the eigenvalues of the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator are nonzero.

Finally, let us translate the general equations into the language of the GHP formalism [21, 20]. Thus let us fix a normalized spinor dyad $\{o^A, \iota^A\}$ adapted to the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ (i.e. the complex null vectors $m^a := o^A\bar\iota^{A'}$ and $\bar m^a := \iota^A\bar o^{A'}$ are tangent to $\mathcal{S}$). Then the GHP form of the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator and the square of the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator are

$$\bar o^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^A\lambda_A = \eth'\lambda_0 + \rho\lambda_1, \tag{2.13}$$

$$-\bar\iota^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^A\lambda_A = \eth\lambda_1 + \rho'\lambda_0, \tag{2.14}$$

$$o^A\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B = \eth\eth'\lambda_0 + \big(\eth\rho\big)\lambda_1 - \rho\rho'\lambda_0, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\iota^A\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B = \eth'\eth\lambda_1 + \big(\eth'\rho'\big)\lambda_0 - \rho\rho'\lambda_1. \tag{2.16}$$

Here we defined the spinor components by the conventions $\lambda_0 := \lambda_A o^A$ and $\lambda_1 := \lambda_A \iota^A$; $\eth$ and $\eth'$ are the standard edth operators and ρ and ρ' are the standard GHP convergences corresponding to the outgoing and incoming null normals $o^A\bar o^{A'}$ and $\iota^A\bar\iota^{A'}$ of $\mathcal{S}$, respectively. The dimension of the kernel of the edth operators depends on the genus of the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ [22]: let p be any real number. Then on topological 2-spheres $\dim\ker\eth_{(p,p+n)} = \dim\ker\eth'_{(p+n,p)} = 0$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, while $\dim\ker\eth_{(p+n,p)} = \dim\ker\eth'_{(p,p+n)} = 1 + n$ for any $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. On tori $\dim\ker\eth_{(p,p+n)} = \dim\ker\eth'_{(p,p+n)} = 1$ for any integer n. On surfaces with genus $g \geq 2$ one has $\dim\ker\eth_{(p,p+n)} = \dim\ker\eth'_{(p+n,p)} = 0$ if $-n \in \mathbb{N}$, it is 1 if $n = 0$, it is $g-1$ if $n = 1$, it is g if $n = 2$ and it is $(n-1)(g-1)$ if $n > 2$.

2.3 Special vector fields built from the eigenspinors

The Weyl eigenspinors define several Δ_e-divergence-free complex Lorentzian vector fields on $\mathcal{S}$. In fact, let λ^A and $\bar\mu^{A'}$ be the unprimed and primed Weyl spinor parts of a Dirac eigenspinor Ψ^α, respectively. Then contracting the first equation of (2.10) with $\bar\mu^{A'}$ and the second equation of (2.10) with λ^A, and adding them together we obtain

$$\Delta_{AA'}(\lambda^A\bar\mu^{A'}) = 0; \tag{2.17}$$

i.e. $K^a := \lambda^A\bar\mu^{A'}$ *is a* Δ_e*-divergence-free complex vector field on* $\mathcal{S}$. Similarly, the contraction of the first equation of (2.10) with $\bar\lambda^{A'}$ gives $\bar\lambda^{A'}\Delta_{A'A}\lambda^A = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha\bar\Phi$, and the contraction of the second equation of (2.10) with μ^A gives $\mu^A\Delta_{AA'}\bar\mu^{A'} = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha\Phi$, where $\Phi := \lambda^A\mu_A$. These imply that

$$\Delta_{AA'}\big(\lambda^A\bar\lambda^{A'}\big) = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\big(\bar\alpha\Phi - \alpha\bar\Phi\big), \qquad \Delta_{AA'}\big(\mu^A\bar\mu^{A'}\big) = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\big(\alpha\Phi - \bar\alpha\bar\Phi\big);$$

and hence, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, that

$$\Delta_{AA'}\Big(a\lambda^A\bar\lambda^{A'} + b\mu^A\bar\mu^{A'}\Big) = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\big(a\bar\alpha + b\alpha\big)\Phi - \big(a\alpha + b\bar\alpha\big)\bar\Phi\Big). \tag{2.18}$$

Therefore, *the real vector field* $Z^a_\pm := \lambda^A\bar\lambda^{A'} \pm \mu^A\bar\mu^{A'}$ *is* Δ_e*-divergence free for purely imaginary/real eigenvalue* α.

These vector fields can be recovered as special cases of $V_e := \Phi_\alpha\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\Psi^\beta$, built from the Dirac eigenspinors Φ^α and Ψ^α. In fact, if

$$\mathrm{i}\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\Delta^e\Psi^\beta = \alpha\Psi^\alpha, \qquad \mathrm{i}\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\Delta^e\Phi^\beta = \beta\Phi^\alpha,$$

then $\mathrm{i}\Delta^e(\Phi_\alpha\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\Psi^\beta) = (\alpha - \beta)\Phi_\alpha\Psi^\alpha$. Therefore, if $\Phi^\alpha = (\phi^A, \bar\omega^{A'})$ and $\Psi^\alpha = (\lambda^A, \bar\mu^{A'})$ are eigenspinors with the same eigenvalue, say α, then the vector field $V_e := \Phi_\alpha\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\Psi^\beta = -\sqrt{2}(\lambda_E\bar\omega_{E'} + \phi_E\bar\mu_{E'})$ is Δ_e-divergence free. In particular, (1) if $\Phi_\alpha=\Psi_\alpha$, then $V^e=-2\sqrt{2}\lambda^E\bar\mu^{E'}=-2\sqrt{2}K^e$; (2) if $\Phi^+_\alpha=\Psi_\alpha$ (i.e. $\omega_A=\lambda_A$ and $\phi_A=\mu_A$), and hence Ψ^α is an eigenspinor with the eigenvalue $-\bar\alpha$ too and α is imaginary, then $V^e=-\sqrt{2}(\lambda^E\bar\lambda^{E'}+\mu^E\bar\mu^{E'})=-\sqrt{2}Z^e_+$; (3) if $\Phi^+_\alpha\eta^\alpha{}_\beta=\Psi_\beta$ (i.e. $\mathrm{i}\omega_A=\lambda_A$ and $\mathrm{i}\phi_A=\mu_A$), and hence Ψ^α is an eigenspinor with the eigenvalue $\bar\alpha$ too and α is real, then $V^e=-\mathrm{i}\sqrt{2}(\lambda^E\bar\lambda^{E'}-\mu^E\bar\mu^{E'})=-\mathrm{i}\sqrt{2}Z^e_-$.

Another class of special vector fields can be constructed purely from the unprimed Weyl spinor parts of one or two Dirac eigenspinors and their derivatives. Next we consider these. Contracting the identity (2.4) with an arbitrary spinor field ϕ^A, using the relationship between the two derivative operators $\Delta_{EE'}$ and $\delta_{EE'}$ and the reality property $Q^A{}_{AE'B}=\bar Q^{A'}{}_{A'BE'}$, a straightforward calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned}-2\phi^A\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B=\phi^A\Delta_e\Delta^e\lambda_A+\frac{1}{4}f\phi^A\lambda_A-2Q_{AeB}\phi^A\Delta^e\lambda^B-\\ -\big(\Delta^eQ_{AeB}\big)\phi^A\lambda^B+2\big(\Delta_A{}^{A'}Q^D{}_{DA'B}\big)\lambda^A\phi^B+\frac{1}{2}\lambda^A\phi_AQ_{BeD}Q^{BeD}.\end{aligned}$$

Interchanging the spinor fields λ_A and ϕ_A, adding the resulting formula to the old one and using $\phi^A\Delta_e\Delta^e\lambda_A=\Delta_e(\phi^A\Delta^e\lambda_A)-(\Delta_e\phi^A)(\Delta^e\lambda_A)$, we obtain the geometric identity

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_e\Big(\phi^A\delta^e\lambda_A+\lambda^A\delta^e\phi_A\Big)&=\Delta_e\Big(\phi^A\Delta^e\lambda_A+\lambda^A\Delta^e\phi_A-2Q_A{}^e{}_B\lambda^A\phi^B\Big)=\\ &=-2\Big(\phi^A\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B+\lambda^A\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\phi_B\Big)-\\ &\quad-2\big(\Delta_A{}^{A'}Q^D{}_{DA'B}\big)\Big(\lambda^A\phi^B+\phi^A\lambda^B\Big).\end{aligned}\tag{2.19}$$

If the last term vanishes, e.g. when $\Delta_{(A}{}^{A'}Q_{B)A'D}{}^D=0$ holds, and if there is a function $\alpha:\mathcal{S}\to\mathbb{C}$ such that

$$-\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B=\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\lambda_A,\qquad -\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B\phi_B=\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\phi_A,\tag{2.20}$$

then the vector field

$$\xi^e:=\phi^A\delta^e\lambda_A+\lambda^A\delta^e\phi_A\tag{2.21}$$

is δ_e (and, in fact, Δ_e)-divergence free. Therefore, in particular when λ_A and ϕ_A are Weyl eigenspinors with the same eigenvalue (e.g. if $\phi_A=\lambda_A$), then in the special case $\Delta_{(A}{}^{A'}Q_{B)A'D}{}^D=0$ the (in general complex) tangent vector field ξ^e is divergence free on $\mathcal{S}$ (both with respect to δ_e and Δ_e). Since in the GHP formalism $\Delta_{(A}{}^{A'}Q_{B)A'D}{}^D=(\eth'\rho')o_Ao_B-(\eth\rho)\iota_A\iota_B$, the vanishing of this term is equivalent to $\eth\rho=0$, $\eth'\rho=0$, $\eth\rho'=0$ and $\eth'\rho'=0$; i.e. the convergences are constant on $\mathcal{S}$.

ξ^e can be generalized to be $\Phi^\alpha\delta^e\Psi_\alpha+\Psi^\alpha\delta^e\Phi_\alpha$, which is δ_e-divergence free if Φ^α and Ψ^α are Dirac eigenspinors with the same eigenvalue and $\Delta_{(A}{}^{A'}Q_{B)A'D}{}^D$ $=0$.

2.4 The reality of the eigenvalues

The Δ_e-divergence of $Z^{\underline{a}}_-$ vanishes if it is built from eigenspinors with *real* eigenvalue. Thus we should find some criteria of the reality of the eigenvalues. The usual proof of the reality of the eigenvalues is based on the existence of a positive definite Hermitian metric compatible with the connection underlying the Dirac operator. However, in the light of the non-existence result even for the δ_e-Dirac operator (see the appendix), the condition of this reality should be searched for following a different strategy. First, one might be tempted to define the eigenvalue problem (2.10) with the additional requirement that $\mu_A = c\lambda_A$ for some complex constant c. (In the language of Dirac spinors a spinor Ψ^α with $\mu^A = \lambda^A$ is called a Majorana spinor.) However, by (2.10) this would imply that $|c| = 1$ and $\bar\alpha = -\alpha$, and hence that all the eigenvalues of $-\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$ would be non-positive. We will see that this cannot be the case: for round spheres the eigenvalues of $-\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$, maybe apart from finitely many of them, are all *positive*.

Another strategy is to introduce a *global* Hermitian scalar product directly on the space $C^\infty(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{S}^A)$ of all smooth spinor fields on $\mathcal{S}$, without trying to link this with any *pointwise* Hermitian scalar product $G_{AA'}$. This is based on the integral of the Nester–Witten 2-form built from the Weyl spinors [23]. For any pair (λ_A, ω_A) of spinor fields it can be rewritten in the form [24]

$$H\bigl[\lambda_A, \bar\omega_{A'}\bigr] = \frac{1}{4\pi G}\oint_{\mathcal{S}} \bar\gamma^{A'B'}\bar\omega_{A'}\Delta_{B'}{}^B\lambda_B \mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}. \tag{2.22}$$

It is a straightforward calculation to show that it is Hermitian in the sense that $H[\lambda_A, \bar\omega_{A'}] = \overline{H[\omega_A, \bar\lambda_{A'}]}$, where overline denotes complex conjugation. In particular, $H[\lambda_A, \bar\lambda_{A'}]$ is always real, but in general it may be negative or zero even for non-vanishing spinor fields. Then with the substitution $\bar\omega_{A'} := \Delta_{A'}{}^B\pi_B$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{H\bigl[\Delta_A{}^{B'}\bar\pi_{B'}, \bar\lambda_{A'}\bigr]} &= H\bigl[\lambda_A, \Delta_{A'}{}^B\pi_B\bigr] = \frac{1}{4\pi G}\oint_{\mathcal{S}} \bar\gamma^{A'B'}\bigl(\Delta_{A'}{}^A\pi_A\bigr)\bigl(\Delta_{B'}{}^B\lambda_B\bigr)\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S} \\ &= H\bigl[\pi_A, \Delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B\bigr];\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

i.e. the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator is compatible with the Hermitian scalar product. This implies that

$$H\bigl[\Delta_A{}^{B'}\Delta_{B'}{}^B\sigma_B, \bar\lambda_{A'}\bigr] = H\bigl[\sigma_A, \Delta_{A'}{}^B\Delta_B{}^{B'}\bar\lambda_{B'}\bigr] \tag{2.24}$$

for any pair (σ_A, λ_A) of spinor fields; i.e. $\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$ *is formally self-adjoint with respect to* H.

It might be worth noting that originally the Nester–Witten integral was introduced as a Hermitian quadratic form on the space of Dirac spinor fields [25, 26], and, with the representation $\Psi^\alpha = (\lambda^A, \bar\mu^{A'})$, this can be written as $H[\lambda_A, \bar\lambda_{A'}] - H[\mu_A, \bar\mu_{A'}]$. A natural extension of (2.22) as a Hermitian bilinear form to Dirac spinors (and of the original Nester–Witten integral too) is the integral of

$$\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\Phi_\alpha\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\varepsilon^{ef}\Delta_f\Psi^\beta=\Bigl(\bar\gamma^{A'B'}\bar\omega_{A'}\Delta_{B'}{}^B\lambda_B-\gamma^{AB}\phi_A\Delta_B{}^{B'}\bar\mu_{B'}\Bigr)$$

for any pair of Dirac spinors $\Psi^\alpha=(\lambda^A,\bar\mu^{A'})$ and $\Phi^\alpha=(\phi^A,\bar\omega^{A'})$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\bigl(\Psi^\alpha,\Phi^\alpha\bigr)\mapsto H\bigl[\Psi_\alpha,\Phi^+_\alpha\bigr]:&=\frac{1}{4\pi G}\oint_{\mathcal{S}}\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\Phi^+_\alpha\gamma^\alpha_{e\beta}\varepsilon^{ef}\Delta_f\Psi^\beta\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}=\\&=H\bigl[\lambda_A,\bar\phi_{A'}\bigr]-H\bigl[\omega_A,\bar\mu_{A'}\bigr]\end{aligned}$$

is Hermitian, and reduces to (2.22) if at least one of Ψ^α and Φ^α has definite $\eta^\alpha{}_\beta$-chirality (e.g. when $\omega^A=0$ or $\mu^A=0$). Interestingly enough, if the Dirac spinors have definite, but opposite $\eta^\alpha{}_\beta$-chirality, e.g. when $\phi^A=0$ and $\mu^A=0$, then they are orthogonal to each other: $H[\Psi_\alpha,\Phi^+_\alpha]=0$.

Returning to the characterization of the reality of the eigenvalues of the Dirac operators, suppose that λ_A satisfies (2.12). Then (2.24) implies that $\alpha^2H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]=\bar\alpha^2H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]$, i.e. *$\alpha$ is real or purely imaginary provided $H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]\neq0$.* The reality of α can be characterized by the H-norm of the eigenspinors. Indeed, for λ_A and μ_A satisfying (2.10) with non-zero α, (2.22) gives

$$\bar\alpha H\bigl[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}\bigr]=-\alpha H\bigl[\mu_A,\bar\mu_{A'}\bigr].$$

This implies that $H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]=\pm H[\mu_A,\bar\mu_{A'}]$, and, for $H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]\neq0$, we obtain that *$\alpha$ is real iff $H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]=-H[\mu_A,\bar\mu_{A'}]$, and α is purely imaginary iff $H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]=H[\mu_A,\bar\mu_{A'}]$.* In subsection 4.1 we give examples both for real and purely imaginary eigenvalues. α can be a more general complex number only if $H[\lambda_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]=0$, i.e. when $\oint_{\mathcal{S}}\gamma^{AB}\lambda_A\mu_B\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}=0$. If σ_A is an eigenspinor of $-2\Delta_A{}^{B'}\Delta_{B'}{}^B$ with eigenvalue β^2, then (2.24) gives that $(\beta^2-\bar\alpha^2)H[\sigma_A,\bar\lambda_{A'}]=0$; i.e. *the eigenspinors of $-2\Delta_A{}^{B'}\Delta_{B'}{}^B$ with eigenvalues α^2 and β^2, satisfying $\bar\alpha\neq\pm\beta$, are orthogonal to each other with respect to H.*

3 The $\delta_{AA'}$–Dirac operator

Since $\mathcal{S}$ is even dimensional, there is a notion of chirality in the space of surface spinors too, which chirality remains intact even if the gauge group $SO(2)$ is enlarged to $SO(2)\times SO(1,1)$ by including the boost gauge transformations in the normal bundle of $\mathcal{S}$. This chirality is represented by the spinor $\gamma^A{}_B$ (thus we call it the 'γ-chirality'), and is preserved by δ_e but *not* by Δ_e. (For the details see [18, 5].) Thus it seems useful to discuss the consequences of the existence of the γ-chirality in the case of the $\delta_{AA'}$–Dirac operator.

The $\delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator can be obtained from the $\Delta_{AA'}$–Dirac operator with the formal substitution $Q^A{}_{eB}=0$; and in this case the eigenvalue problem (2.10) reduces to

$$\mathrm{i}\delta_{A'}{}^{A}\lambda_A=-\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}}\bar\mu_{A'},\qquad \mathrm{i}\delta_{A}{}^{A'}\bar\mu_{A'}=-\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_A. \tag{3.1}$$

It is easy to show (using e.g. the second order equation $-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^{B}\lambda_B=\alpha^2\lambda_A$) that this notion of eigenspinors coincides with that defined by (2.6) if a constant Hermitian metric $G_{AA'}$ exists on the spinor bundle. In this case $\bar\mu_{A'}=G_{A'A}\lambda^A$.

Recalling that $\delta_e\gamma^A{}_B=0$, $\gamma^A{}_B\gamma^B{}_C=\delta^A_C$ and that $\gamma^A{}_B\bar\gamma^{A'}{}_{B'}$ acts on vectors tangent to $\mathcal{S}$ as $-\delta^a_b$, it is easy to verify that

$$\bar\gamma_{A'}{}^{B'}\bigl(\delta_{B'}{}^{B}\lambda_B\bigr)=\delta_{A'}{}^{A}\bigl(\gamma_A{}^{B}\lambda_B\bigr),\qquad \gamma_A{}^{B}\bigl(\delta_B{}^{B'}\delta_{B'}{}^{C}\lambda_B\bigr)=\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^{B}\bigl(\gamma_B{}^{C}\lambda_C\bigr). \tag{3.2}$$

Thus the $\delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator commutes with the action of the γ-spinor as a base point preserving bundle map. In particular, if λ_A is a Weyl eigenspinor of $-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^{B}$ with eigenvalue α^2, then $\gamma_A{}^B\lambda_B$ is also a Weyl eigenspinor with the *same* eigenvalue. This implies that both $\lambda_A\pm\gamma_A{}^B\lambda_B$ are Weyl eigenspinors with the same eigenvalue α^2, but they have *definite γ-chirality*. In the GHP spinor dyad $\{o^A,\iota^A\}$ the right/left handed Weyl eigenspinors of $-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^{B}$ have the structure $-\lambda_0\iota_A$ and $\lambda_1 o_A$, respectively, where, by (2.15)-(2.16), the spinor components satisfy

$$-2\eth\eth'\lambda_0=\alpha^2\lambda_0,\qquad -2\eth'\eth\lambda_1=\alpha^2\lambda_1. \tag{3.3}$$

Thus the γ-chirality can be used to decompose the space of the eigenspinors further. Since, however, $\gamma^A{}_B$ is annihilated only by δ_e but *not* by Δ_e in general, this decomposition is possible only for the $\delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operators. Using the list of the dimension of the kernel of the edth operators, by (3.3) we can determine the number of the (e.g. right handed) eigenspinors of $-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^{B}$ with zero eigenvalue: on topological 2-spheres there are no such eigenspinors, on tori there are two, while on higher genus ($g>1$) surfaces there are $2(g-1)$ ones.

Clearly, there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the eigenspinors λ_A of $-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^{B}$ with eigenvalue α^2 and the eigenspinors $(\lambda_A,\bar\mu_{A'})$ of (3.1). Moreover, if λ_A has definite chirality, e.g. if $\gamma_A{}^B\lambda_B=\pm\lambda_A$, then μ_A has the same definite chirality: $\gamma_A{}^B\mu_B=\pm\mu_A$. Thus the natural one-to-one correspondence above preserves the γ-chirality as well, and the space of the eigenspinors splits in a natural way to the direct sum of the spaces of the right/left handed eigenspinors.

By the analysis of subsection 2.3, the Weyl eigenspinors define a collection of δ_e-divergence-free complex vector fields on $\mathcal{S}$. Indeed, taking into account that δ_e commutes with the projection Π^a_b, the complex vector field $k^a:=\Pi^a_b\lambda^B\bar\mu^{B'}$, tangent to $\mathcal{S}$, is δ_e-divergence free on $\mathcal{S}$. Similarly, $z^a_\pm:=\Pi^a_b(\lambda^B\bar\lambda^{B'}\pm\mu^B\bar\mu^{B'})$ is δ_e-divergence free on $\mathcal{S}$ for purely imaginary/real eigenvalue α. The vector fields k^a and $z^a_\pm$ are vanishing for eigenspinors with definite chirality, because then the null vectors $\lambda^A\bar\mu^{A'}$, $\lambda^A\bar\lambda^{A'}$ and $\mu^A\bar\mu^{A'}$ are all orthogonal to $\mathcal{S}$.

Similarly, the formal substitution $Q^A{}_{EE'B}=0$ in (2.19) yields that $\xi^e=\phi^A\delta^e\lambda_A+\lambda^A\delta^e\phi_A$ is a δ_e-divergence-free complex tangent vector field on $\mathcal{S}$ if

$-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^B\lambda_B = \alpha^2\lambda_A$ and $-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^B\phi_B = \alpha^2\phi_A$ hold for some function $\alpha : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{C}$, e.g. when λ_A and ϕ_A are Weyl eigenspinors with the *same* eigenvalue. If λ_A and ϕ_A have the same, definite chirality, then the vector field ξ^a itself is vanishing.

The analysis of subsection 2.4 can be repeated to obtain criteria for the reality of the eigenvalue α. The only difference is that the Hermitian scalar product on $C^\infty(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{S}^A)$ should be defined by

$$h\big[\lambda_A, \bar\omega_{A'}\big] := \frac{1}{4\pi G}\oint_{\mathcal{S}} \bar\gamma^{A'B'}\bar\omega_{A'}\delta_{B'}{}^B\lambda_B \mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then, for $h[\lambda_A, \bar\lambda_{A'}] \neq 0$, the non-zero α is real iff $h[\lambda_A, \bar\lambda_{A'}] = -h[\mu_A, \bar\mu_{A'}]$; and it is purely imaginary iff $h[\lambda_A, \bar\lambda_{A'}] = h[\mu_A, \bar\mu_{A'}]$. However, for eigenspinors with definite chirality the norm $h[\lambda_A, \bar\lambda_{A'}]$ is always zero, and hence the corresponding eigenvalue may in principle be a (not necessarily real or purely imaginary) complex number.

4 On round spheres

4.1 The spectrum

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a round sphere of radius r; i.e. $\mathcal{S}$ is a transitivity surface of the rotation group in a spherically symmetric spacetime, whose radius is defined by $4\pi r^2 := \mathrm{Area}(\mathcal{S})$. Then the connection in the normal bundle is flat, and by an appropriate boost gauge choice $\rho, \rho' = \mathrm{const}$ can be achieved. To solve (2.11), it could be a good strategy to solve (3.3) first, and return to (2.11) later. We expand the spinor components λ_0 and λ_1 in terms of the spin weighted spherical harmonics:

$$\lambda_0 = \sum_{j=\frac{1}{2}}^{\infty}\sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_0^{j,m}\,{}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm}, \qquad \lambda_1 = \sum_{j=\frac{1}{2}}^{\infty}\sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_1^{j,m}\,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $j = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}, \ldots$ and $m = -j, -j+1, \ldots, j$; and $c_0^{j,m}$ and $c_1^{j,m}$ are complex constants. Since (see. e.g. [20])

$$\eth\,{}_sY_{jm} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}r}\sqrt{\big(j+s+1\big)\big(j-s\big)}\,{}_{s+1}Y_{jm}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\eth'\,{}_sY_{jm} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}r}\sqrt{\big(j-s+1\big)\big(j+s\big)}\,{}_{s-1}Y_{jm}, \tag{4.3}$$

the eigenvalue equations (3.3) reduce to

$$\sum_{j,m} c_0^{j,m}\Big(\alpha^2 - \frac{1}{r^2}\big(j+\frac{1}{2}\big)^2\Big)\,{}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm} = 0, \quad \sum_{j,m} c_1^{j,m}\Big(\alpha^2 - \frac{1}{r^2}\big(j+\frac{1}{2}\big)^2\Big)\,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm} = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Because of the completeness of the spherical harmonics these imply that the eigenvalues α^2 are *discrete*:

$$\alpha^2 = \frac{n^2}{r^2}, \qquad n := j + \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4.5}$$

and that, for a given allowed α and the corresponding j,

$$\lambda_0 = \sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_0^m \,{}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm}, \qquad \lambda_1 = \sum_{m=-j}^{j} c_1^m \,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm} \tag{4.6}$$

for some complex constants c_0^m and c_1^m. Thus the space of the right/left handed Weyl eigenspinors is spanned by c_0^m and c_1^m, respectively, and hence the dimension of these spaces is $2j+1=2n$. Then the eigenvalues can also be expressed by the (constant) scalar curvature R of the intrinsic geometry of $\mathcal{S}$ as $\alpha^2 = n^2 \frac{1}{2}R$. Therefore, the first eigenvalue already contains all the information about (i.e. the only observable of) the geometry of $\mathcal{S}$. The eigenvalues of the $\delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator are $\alpha = \pm n/r$, and the components of the corresponding primed Weyl spinor are $\bar\mu_{0'} = \mp \mathrm{i} \sum_m c_0^m \,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm}$ and $\bar\mu_{1'} = \mp \mathrm{i} \sum_m c_1^m \,{}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm}$. We note that for round spheres δ_e-constant Hermitian metrics $G_{AA'}$ do exist, and the present particular results can be compared with the general ones obtained in pure Riemannian geometry: the spectrum (4.5) saturates the inequalities of [11, 12, 13, 15, 14, 16].

By (2.15)-(2.16) the eigenvalue problem for the operators $-2\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$ and $\Delta_{A'}{}^A$ can be solved in an analogous way. The structure of the unprimed Weyl spinor part of the eigenspinors is similar to that given by (4.6). The only difference is that the primed Weyl spinor part change slightly and the eigenvalues are shifted by a term built from the convergences:

$$\alpha^2 = \frac{1}{r^2}\bigl(n^2 + 2r^2\rho\rho'\bigr), \qquad n := j + \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.7}$$

In contrast to (4.5) this can be zero or even negative in certain special geometries. For example, in spacetimes with constant curvature the two convergences can be chosen to be $\rho = -\frac{1}{r}\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2}$ and $\rho' = \frac{1}{2r}\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2}$, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and hence $1 + 2r^2\rho\rho' = \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2$. In Minkowski spacetime ($\Lambda = 0$) α^2 is zero, while in the anti-de Sitter spacetime ($\Lambda < 0$) it is negative (i.e. α is purely *imaginary*) for $n=1$. (For a more general discussion of the kernel of the $\Delta_{AA'}$-Dirac operator on round spheres, see [2].) Remarkably enough, by (4.7) the first eigenvalue is connected with the Hawking quasi-local mass: $\alpha_1^2 = 2GE_H(\mathcal{S})/r^3$. Therefore, the first two eigenvalues of $-2\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$, or the first eigenvalue of $-2\delta_A{}^{A'}\delta_{A'}{}^B$ and of $-2\Delta_A{}^{A'}\Delta_{A'}{}^B$ give the only two non-trivial gauge invariant observables of the 2-surface in spacetime, namely the scalar curvature R and the length $8\rho\rho'$ of the mean curvature vector, or, in other combination, the area of the surface and the Hawking energy.

The components of the primed Weyl spinor part $\bar\mu_{A'}$ of the eigenspinors of the Δ_e-Dirac operator can be calculated easily from (2.10). Since, however, in the present paper primarily we are interested in the δ_e-divergence free vector fields, we do not need them in what follows.

4.2 The divergence free vector fields

For given j the δ_e-divergence free vector field $k^a=\Pi^a_b\lambda^B\bar\mu^{B'}$ takes the form

$$k^a=\pm{\rm i}\Bigl(\sum_{k,m}c^k_0c^m_1\,{}_{-\frac12}Y_{jk}\,{}_{-\frac12}Y_{jm}\Bigr)m^a\pm{\rm i}\Bigl(\sum_{k,m}c^k_0c^m_1\,{}_{\frac12}Y_{jk}\,{}_{\frac12}Y_{jm}\Bigr)\bar m^a,$$

where $m^a=\frac{1}{\sqrt2 r}(1+\zeta\bar\zeta)(\frac{\partial}{\partial\zeta})^a$. In particular, for $j=\frac12$ the explicit form of this vector field in the standard complex stereographic coordinates $(\zeta,\bar\zeta)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\pm\,k^a=&-\frac{\rm i}{2\pi}\frac{1}{1+\zeta\bar\zeta}\Bigl(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}-\bigl(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}\bigr)\bar\zeta+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}\bar\zeta^2\Bigr)m^a-\\&-\frac{\rm i}{2\pi}\frac{1}{1+\zeta\bar\zeta}\Bigl(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}\zeta^2+\bigl(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}\bigr)\zeta+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}\Bigr)\bar m^a.\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

Since there are no harmonic forms on spheres, by the Hodge decomposition theorem the divergence-free rk^a can always be written as $\varepsilon^{ab}\delta_bF$ for some function $F:\mathcal{S}\to\mathbb{C}$. A short calculation yields that this is indeed the case with

$$F=\mp\frac{r^2}{\sqrt2\pi}\frac{c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}\bar\zeta-c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}\zeta+\bigl(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}\bigr)\zeta\bar\zeta}{1+\zeta\bar\zeta},\tag{4.9}$$

where the irrelevant constant of integration has been chosen to be zero. k^a (and hence the function F also) is real precisely when

$$c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}=a+{\rm i}b,\qquad c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}=-a+{\rm i}b,\qquad c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}=2c\tag{4.10}$$

for some real constants a, b and c. If we write $c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}=:c+d+{\rm i}e$ for some real d and e, and hence $c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}=c-d-{\rm i}e$, then $-(a^2+b^2)=(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{\frac12})(c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12})=(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12})(c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{\frac12})=c^2-d^2+e^2-{\rm i}2ed$. Since its left hand side is nonpositive, the right hand side must also be real and nonpositive, implying that $e=0$, and hence that $d^2=a^2+b^2+c^2$.

Since $\mathcal{S}$ is two dimensional, in the case of real F the level sets $F=$ const are precisely the integral curves of the vector field k^a, and F is given explicitly by

$$F=\mp\frac{r^2}{\sqrt2\pi}\frac{a\bigl(\zeta+\bar\zeta\bigr)+{\rm i}b\bigl(\bar\zeta-\zeta\bigr)+2c\zeta\bar\zeta}{1+\zeta\bar\zeta}={\rm const}\mp\frac{r}{\sqrt2\pi}\Bigl(ax+by+cz\Bigr).\tag{4.11}$$

(Here x, y and z are the standard Cartesian coordinates defined by $x+{\rm i}y:=2r\zeta/(1+\zeta\bar\zeta)$ and $z:=r(\zeta\bar\zeta-1)/((1+\zeta\bar\zeta).)$ However, the corresponding level sets are just the integral curves of the Killing vectors of the metric 2-sphere. In fact, in these coordinates the standard rotation Killing 1-forms are

$$
\begin{aligned}
K^{23}_a &= \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{r}{1+\zeta\bar\zeta}\Big(\big(1-\bar\zeta^2\big)m_a-\big(1-\zeta^2\big)\bar m_a\Big),\\
K^{31}_a &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{r}{1+\zeta\bar\zeta}\Big(\big(1+\bar\zeta^2\big)m_a+\big(1+\zeta^2\big)\bar m_a\Big),\\
K^{12}_a &= \frac{\mathrm{i}r\sqrt{2}}{1+\zeta\bar\zeta}\Big(\bar\zeta m_a-\zeta\bar m_a\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.12}
$$

Comparing these with (4.8), we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
rk_a = \pm\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi}\Big(\big(c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}-c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}\big)K^{23}_a-\mathrm{i}\big(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}\big)K^{31}_a+\\
+\big(c_0^{\frac12}c_1^{-\frac12}+c_0^{-\frac12}c_1^{\frac12}\big)K^{12}_a\Big);
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.13}
$$

i.e. *on round spheres of radius r the δ_e-divergence free vector field k^a built from the $j=\frac{1}{2}$ eigenspinors is $1/r$-times a complex combination of the rotation Killing vectors.*

By a similar analysis one can determine the vector fields k^a for all $j>\frac{1}{2}$. In particular, for $j=\frac{3}{2}$ there are precisely *ten* such complex independent vector fields. The functions F corresponding to the independent real vector fields rk^a are cubic expressions of the Cartesian coordinates x, y and z, divided by r, e.g. $(x^3-3xy^2)/r$, xyz/r, ... etc. However, their significance and geometric meaning are still not quite clear.

Since the eigenvalues α^2 are real, the vector fields z^a_- are δ_e divergence free. Repeating the analysis above, a direct calculation shows that for $j=\frac{1}{2}$ these vector fields have the form $\frac{1}{r}(AK^{23}_a+BK^{31}_a+CK^{12}_a)$ for some *real* constants A, B and C; i.e. *for $j=\frac{1}{2}$ the vector field rz^a_- is a real linear combination of the three rotation Killing vectors.* For $j=\frac{1}{2}$ the vector field ξ^a is also proportional to the rotation Killing vector fields. Since, however, ξ^a is built from the *first derivative* of the Weyl spinor parts of the eigenspinor, it scales with a different power of the radius: $\xi_a=\frac{1}{r^2}(AK^{23}_a+BK^{31}_a+CK^{12}_a)$ with appropriate (complex) constants A, B and C. We continue the discussion of k^a and z^a_- in a more general context in subsections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, respectively.

5 On large spheres near the null infinity

5.1 Asymptotically flat spacetimes

Let the spacetime be asymptotically flat at future null infinity, and let $(u,r,\zeta,\bar\zeta)$ be a Bondi-type coordinate system (see e.g. [27]). Then the standard edth operators, acting on (p,q) type scalar f, take the form $\eth f=P(\partial f/\partial\bar\zeta)+$

$Q(\partial f/\partial\zeta) - p\beta f + q\bar\beta' f$ and $\eth' f = P(\partial f/\partial\zeta) + \bar Q(\partial f/\partial\bar\zeta) + p\beta' f - q\bar\beta f$, respectively. (For the definition of the GHP spin coefficients see [21, 20].) The GHP spin frame is chosen such that o^A is parallelly propagated along the null geodesic generators of the null hypersurfaces $u =$ const, and ι^A is chosen such that $m^a := o^A\bar\iota^{A'}$ and $\bar m^a := \iota^A\bar o^{A'}$ be tangents to the spacelike 2-surfaces $u =$ const, $r =$ const. In this case $\bar\beta' = \beta - \tau$. In these coordinates and spin frame in an Einstein–Maxwell spacetime the asymptotic form of the functions P and Q and some of the spin coefficients that we need are well known [28] to be given by $P = \frac{1}{r\sqrt2}(1+\zeta\bar\zeta) + O(r^{-3})$, $Q = -\frac{1}{r^2\sqrt2}(1+\zeta\bar\zeta)\sigma^0 + O(r^{-4})$, $\beta = -\frac{1}{r2\sqrt2}\zeta - \frac{1}{r^2 2\sqrt2}\bar\zeta\sigma^0 + O(r^{-3})$ and $\tau = \frac{1}{r^2}{}_0\eth'\sigma^0 - \frac{1}{r^3}(2\sigma^0{}_0\eth\bar\sigma^0 + \psi^0_1) + O(r^{-4})$. Here ${}_0\eth$ and ${}_0\eth'$ denote the edth operators on the metric, unit sphere, σ^0 is the asymptotic shear (i.e. $\sigma = \frac{1}{r^2}\sigma^0 + O(r^{-4})$), the dot denotes differentiation with respect to u, and ψ^0_1, ψ^0_2 are the leading terms in the asymptotic expansion of the Weyl spinor components Ψ_1 and Ψ_2, respectively (see e.g. [27, 6]). In addition, the Weyl spinor components satisfy

$$\dot\psi^0_1 = {}_0\eth\psi^0_2 - 2\sigma^0{}_0\eth\dot{\bar\sigma}^0 + 4G\varphi^0_1\bar\varphi^0_2, \tag{5.1}$$

$$\dot\psi^0_2 = -{}_0\eth^2\dot{\bar\sigma}^0_2 - \sigma^0\ddot{\bar\sigma}^0 + 2G\varphi^0_2\bar\varphi^0_2, \tag{5.2}$$

$$\psi^0_2 - \bar\psi^0_2 = {}_0\eth'^2\sigma^0 - {}_0\eth^2\bar\sigma^0 + \bar\sigma^0\dot\sigma^0 - \dot{\bar\sigma}^0\sigma^0. \tag{5.3}$$

Here φ^0_n are the leading terms in the asymptotic expansion of the Maxwell spinor components: $\varphi_n = r^{n-3}\varphi^0_n + O(r^{n-4})$. We will use these formulae in subsection 5.4.3.

5.2 The eigenvalue problem on large spheres

In the Bondi type coordinate system the spacelike 2-surfaces $u =$ const, $r =$ const for large enough r are called large spheres (and will be denoted by $\mathcal{S}_r$), and our aim is to solve the eigenvalue problem (3.3) on these surfaces asymptotically. To do so, let us write the components $\lambda_{\underline{A}}$ of the spinor field λ_A in the GHP spin frame $\varepsilon^A_{\underline{A}} := \{o^A, \iota^A\}$, $\underline{A} = 0, 1$, as $\lambda_{\underline{A}} =: \lambda^{(0)}_{\underline{A}} + \frac{1}{r}\lambda^{(1)}_{\underline{A}} + \dots$ and, similarly, we expand the eigenvalue as $r^2\alpha^2 =: \alpha^2_{(0)} + \frac{1}{r}\alpha^2_{(1)} + \dots$. (Thus we adopt the convention that an index between parentheses, e.g. 0 or 1 here, is referring to the order of approximation.) Then substituting all these into equation (3.3) we obtain

$$2\,{}_0\eth\,{}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_0 + \alpha^2_{(0)}\lambda^{(0)}_0 = 0 \tag{5.4}$$

$$2\,{}_0\eth\,{}_0\eth'\lambda^{(1)}_0 + \alpha^2_{(0)}\lambda^{(1)}_0 = -\alpha^2_{(1)}\lambda^{(0)}_0 + 2{}_0\eth'\big(\sigma^0\,{}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_0\big) + 2{}_0\eth^2\big(\bar\sigma^0\lambda^{(0)}_0\big) \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$2\,{}_0\eth'\,{}_0\eth\lambda^{(0)}_1 + \alpha^2_{(0)}\lambda^{(0)}_1 = 0 \tag{5.6}$$

$$2\,{}_0\eth'\,{}_0\eth\lambda^{(1)}_1 + \alpha^2_{(0)}\lambda^{(1)}_1 = -\alpha^2_{(1)}\lambda^{(0)}_1 + 2{}_0\eth'\big(\sigma^0\,{}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_1\big) + 2\bar\sigma^0\,{}_0\eth^2\lambda^{(0)}_1. \tag{5.7}$$

The zeroth order equations (5.4) and (5.6) are just the eigenvalue equations (3.3) on the unit sphere. Thus in the zeroth order the eigenvalues are $\alpha^2_{(0)} = n^2$, $n := j + \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}$, and the components $\lambda^{(0)}_0$ and $\lambda^{(0)}_1$ of the eigenspinors are given explicitly by (4.6), where in general the expansion coefficients are still arbitrary functions of the retarded time coordinate u. Since the structure of the left hand side of equation (5.5) is similar to the homogeneous (5.4), and that of (5.7) to the homogeneous (5.6), the general solution of the homogeneous equations can be added to the first order corrections $\lambda^{(1)}_0$ and $\lambda^{(1)}_1$, yielding an ambiguity in the order $O(r^{-1})$.

Next let us calculate the first-order correction to the zeroth-order expression of the *first eigenvalue*, $\alpha^2_{(0)} = 1$, and the corresponding eigenspinors. Since $\lambda^{(0)}_0 = {}_{(0)}c^{\frac{1}{2}}_0\,{}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}_0\,{}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\lambda^{(0)}_1 = {}_{(0)}c^{\frac{1}{2}}_1\,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}c^{-\frac{1}{2}}_1\,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}$, where the coefficients ${}_{(0)}c^m_{\underline{A}}$ are functions of u, one has ${}_0\eth\lambda^{(0)}_0 = 0$, ${}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_1 = 0$, ${}_0\eth'^2\lambda^{(0)}_0 = 0$, ${}_0\eth^2\lambda^{(0)}_1 = 0$, and ${}_0\eth{}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{(0)}_0$, ${}_0\eth'{}_0\eth\lambda^{(0)}_1 = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{(0)}_1$. Using these the equations (5.5) and (5.7), respectively, reduce to

$$2\,{}_0\eth\,{}_0\eth'\lambda^{(1)}_0 + \lambda^{(1)}_0 = -\alpha^2_{(1)}\lambda^{(0)}_0 + 2\big({}_0\eth'\sigma^0\big)\big({}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_0\big) + 2\big({}_0\eth^2\bar{\sigma}^0\big)\lambda^{(0)}_0, \tag{5.8}$$

$$2\,{}_0\eth'\,{}_0\eth\lambda^{(1)}_1 + \lambda^{(1)}_1 = -\alpha^2_{(1)}\lambda^{(0)}_1. \tag{5.9}$$

To solve (5.9) let us write $\lambda^{(1)}_1 =: \sum_{j,m}\,{}_{(1)}c^{jm}_1\,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{jm}$ with arbitrary functions ${}_{(1)}c^{jm}_1 = {}_{(1)}c^{jm}_1(u)$. We obtain that $\alpha_{(1)} = 0$ (i.e. in particular the first eigenvalue is real in the first two orders), and all the expansion coefficients ${}_{(1)}c^{jm}_1$ must be zero for $j \geq \frac{3}{2}$. Hence $\lambda^{(1)}_1$ is a combination only of the two $-\frac{1}{2}$ spin weighted spherical harmonics ${}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}\pm\frac{1}{2}}$, i.e. the correction to $\lambda^{(0)}_1$ has the structure similar to that of $\lambda^{(0)}_1$ itself. Thus $\lambda^{(1)}_1$, as the first-order correction to the zeroth-order eigenspinor, represents only a pure (gauge) ambiguity.

To solve (5.8) let us observe that the operator $\eth$ acting on scalars with positive spin weight on topological 2-spheres is surjective (see e.g. [20, 22]). Thus the asymptotic shear σ^0 can always be derived from an appropriate *complex* scalar S of spin weight zero (indeed, of type $(1,1)$): $\sigma^0 = {}_0\eth^2 S$, where the ambiguities in S are the elements of $\ker{}_0\eth^2$, and, on any given surface $u = \text{const}$, they form a four complex dimensional space. Then taking into account $\alpha_{(1)} = 0$ and the commutator $({}_0\eth{}_0\eth' - {}_0\eth'{}_0\eth)f = -\frac{1}{2}(p-q)f$ acting on the (p,q) type scalar f, (5.8) can be written into the form

$${}_0\eth'\Big({}_0\eth\lambda^{(1)}_0 - {}_0\eth^2\big(S - \bar{S}\big)\big({}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_0\big) - \big({}_0\eth'{}_0\eth^2\bar{S}\big)\lambda^{(0)}_0\Big) = 0. \tag{5.10}$$

However, $\dim\ker\eth' = 0$ for positive spin weight scalars on topological 2-spheres, and hence the expression between the big parentheses itself is zero. Nevertheless, using the commutator of ${}_0\eth$ and ${}_0\eth'$ above, this expression can also be rewritten as a pure ${}_0\eth$-derivative, and hence we have

$${}_0\eth\Big(\lambda_0^{(1)} - {}_0\eth\big(S-\bar{S}\big)\big({}_0\eth'\lambda_0^{(0)}\big) - \frac{1}{2}\big(S+\bar{S}\big)\lambda_0^{(0)} - \big({}_0\eth{}_0\eth'\bar{S}\big)\lambda_0^{(0)}\Big) = 0. \tag{5.11}$$

Finally, since $\dim\ker\eth = 2$ for $\eth$ acting on scalars of spin weight $\frac{1}{2}$ on topological 2-spheres, from (5.11) we can deduce that

$$\lambda_0^{(1)} = {}_0\eth\big(S-\bar{S}\big)\big({}_0\eth'\lambda_0^{(0)}\big) + \big({}_0\eth{}_0\eth'\bar{S} + \frac{1}{2}\big(S+\bar{S}\big)\big)\lambda_0^{(0)} + \lambda, \tag{5.12}$$

where λ is an arbitrary spin weight $\frac{1}{2}$ solution of ${}_0\eth\lambda = 0$. Thus, for $j = \frac{1}{2}$, equations (5.4)–(5.7) can be solved *explicitly* in terms of the complex potential S for the asymptotic shear σ^0.

The ambiguities in (5.12), coming from the ambiguity of the potential S (i.e. formally from the non-triviality of the kernel of ${}_0\eth^2$ acting on zero spin weight scalars) and the ambiguity of the solution of the inhomogeneous equation (5.5) (i.e. from the non-triviality of the kernel of ${}_0\eth$ acting on $\frac{1}{2}$ spin weight scalars), can be summarized as

$$\lambda_0^{(1)} \mapsto \lambda_0^{(1)} + \sum_{m=-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} {}_{(1)}c_0^m \, {}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}m}, \tag{5.13}$$

where ${}_{(1)}c_0^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}$ are arbitrary complex functions of u. Here we used the expansion of the products of spin weighted spherical harmonics of the form ${}_0Y_{1M}\,{}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}m}$ and ${}_1Y_{1M}\,{}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}m}$ in terms of ${}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}m}$ and ${}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{3}{2}m'}$, which can easily be derived by direct calculation from the explicit expression of the harmonics given e.g. in [29]. Though in these expansions the spherical harmonics ${}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{3}{2}m}$ do appear, all these are canceled from (5.12). Thus the ambiguities in S described by the ${}_0Y_{1m}$ spherical harmonics are all canceled from the eigenspinors. The remaining scalar ambiguity in S yields an ambiguity in $\lambda_0^{(1)}$ similar to that coming from the solutions of the homogeneous equation. Hence all these can be parameterized only by two (rather than the originally expected six) complex functions of u.

Although there is no *canonical* isomorphism between the spaces of the eigenspinors on two different surfaces even if these spaces can be mapped to each other isomorphically, in the asymptotically flat context we can introduce a natural *equivalence* between the space of the eigenspinors on the large spheres, say $\mathcal{S}'$ and $\mathcal{S}''$, at different retarded times $u = u'$ and $u = u''$. Namely, *we require that the zeroth-order solutions be independent of the retarded time coordinate* u, i.e. we choose the expansion coefficients ${}_{(0)}c_{\underline{A}}^m$ constant. (It is easy to see that this requirement can be extended to the case when the cuts of $\mathscr{I}^+$ that the large spheres define, say $\hat{\mathcal{S}}'$ and $\hat{\mathcal{S}}''$, are related to each other only by a proper BMS *supertranslation*. The basis of this equivalence is the fact that (1) the spinor bases are uniquely determined on the large spheres $\mathcal{S}'$ and $\mathcal{S}''$ such that these bases are related via the spinor constituent of the null geodesic generators of $\mathscr{I}^+$; (2) the coordinates $(\zeta', \bar{\zeta}')$ on $\mathcal{S}'$ determine $(\zeta'', \bar{\zeta}'')$ on $\mathcal{S}''$ uniquely via the null geodesic generators of $\mathscr{I}^+$; (3) in these bases and coordinates the zeroth-order solutions $(\lambda'^{(0)}_0, \lambda'^{(0)}_1)$ on $\mathcal{S}'$ and $(\lambda''^{(0)}_0, \lambda''^{(0)}_1)$ on $\mathcal{S}''$ have the same structure if we expand them in terms of the spin weighted spherical harmonics. Then we identify $(\lambda'^{(0)}_0, \lambda'^{(0)}_1)$ with $(\lambda''^{(0)}_0, \lambda''^{(0)}_1)$ precisely when their spinor components are combined from the spin weighted spherical harmonics by the same complex coefficients. This condition is analogous to a choice of a conformal gauge on $\mathscr{I}^+$. Then an eigenspinor λ'_A on $\mathcal{S}'$ will be called equivalent to the eigenspinor λ''_A on $\mathcal{S}''$ if their zeroth-order parts are the same in the sense above.)

Though this condition does not rule out the u-dependence of the first order correction terms $\lambda^{(1)}_{\underline{A}}$, this makes the whole solution considerably more "rigid", and essentially their u-dependence is already controlled: all of their ambiguities with arbitrary u-dependence have the form

$$\sum_{m=-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} {}_{(1)}c^m_0(u)\, {}_{\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}m}, \qquad \sum_{m=-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} {}_{(1)}c^m_1(u)\, {}_{-\frac{1}{2}}Y_{\frac{1}{2}m}, \tag{5.14}$$

i.e. they belong to the kernel of ${}_0\eth$ and ${}_0\eth'$, respectively, while the u-dependence of the remaining u-dependent parts (of $\lambda^{(1)}_0$, see (5.12)) comes only from the u-dependence of the asymptotic shear. Thus the role of the equivalence is to provide a common, *universal* (i.e. cut-independent) parameter space, namely the space of the zeroth order solutions, by means of which the solutions (up to the ambiguities (5.14)) can be parameterized. As we will see in subsections 5.4.1 and 5.4.2, the general expression of our 2-surface observable is not sensitive to this ambiguity, and this makes it possible to be able to compare angular momenta defined at different retarded times in subsection 5.4.3.

5.3 The δ_e–divergence free vector fields for $j = \frac{1}{2}$

From $\lambda^{(0)}_{\underline{A}}$ and $\lambda^{(1)}_{\underline{A}}$ we can compute the components of $\bar\mu_{A'}$ using (3.1) and the asymptotic form of the edth operators. For the eigenvalue $\alpha_{(0)} = \pm 1$ we have

$$\bar\mu_{0'} = \mp \mathrm{i}\sqrt{2}\Big({}_0\eth'\lambda^{(0)}_0 + \frac{1}{r}{}_0\eth'\lambda^{(1)}_0 - \frac{1}{r}\big({}_0\eth\bar\sigma^0\big)\lambda^{(0)}_0\Big), \tag{5.15}$$

$$\bar\mu_{1'} = \pm \mathrm{i}\sqrt{2}\Big({}_0\eth\lambda^{(0)}_1 + \frac{1}{r}{}_0\eth\lambda^{(1)}_1\Big), \tag{5.16}$$

and in the next two subsections we discuss the δ_e–divergence-free vector fields k^a and z^a_- built from λ_A and $\bar\mu_{A'}$.

5.3.1 The vector field k^a

For the vector field k^a we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pm\, k^a = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{r}\sqrt{2}\ \Big(\ {}_0\eth'\big(\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}\big)\hat{m}^a - {}_0\eth\big(\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}\big)\bar{\hat{m}}^a\Big) + \\
+\frac{\mathrm{i}}{r^2}\sqrt{2}\ \Big(\ \Big[\lambda_1^{(1)}\big({}_0\eth'\lambda_0^{(0)}\big) + \lambda_1^{(0)}\big({}_0\eth'\lambda_0^{(1)}\big) - \lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}\,{}_0\eth\bar{\sigma}^0\Big]\hat{m}^a - \\
- \Big[\lambda_0^{(1)}\big({}_0\eth\lambda_1^{(0)}\big) + \lambda_0^{(0)}\big({}_0\eth\lambda_1^{(1)}\big)\Big]\bar{\hat{m}}^a\Big) + O\big(r^{-3}\big),
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.17}
$$

where $\hat{m}^a := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1+\zeta\bar{\zeta})(\partial/\partial\bar{\zeta})^a$, the complex null vector on the unit sphere, normalized with respect to the unit sphere metric. Since rk^a is divergence free, it can always be written as the dual of the gradient of some function F:

$$
\begin{aligned}
rk^a &= \varepsilon^{ab}\delta_b F = -\mathrm{i}\Big(m^a\eth' F - \bar{m}^a\eth F\Big) = \\
&= \frac{\mathrm{i}}{r^2}\Big(\big({}_0\eth F\big) - \frac{1}{r}\sigma^0\big({}_0\eth' F\big)\Big)\bar{\hat{m}}^a - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{r^2}\Big(\big({}_0\eth' F\big) - \frac{1}{r}\bar{\sigma}^0\big({}_0\eth F\big)\Big)\hat{m}^a.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.18}
$$

Writing the function F as $F =: r^2F^{(-2)} + rF^{(-1)} + O(1)$ and comparing (5.17) with (5.18) we obtain a system of partial differential equations for $F^{(-2)}$ and $F^{(-1)}$. Their integrability condition is satisfied by (5.12), and the solution is

$$
F^{(-2)} = \mp\, \sqrt{2}\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}, \tag{5.19}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(-1)} = \mp\, \sqrt{2}\Big\{&\big({}_0\eth S\big){}_0\eth'\big(\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}\big) + \big({}_0\eth'\bar{S}\big){}_0\eth\big(\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}\big) - \\
&- \frac{1}{2}\big(S+\bar{S}\big){}_0\eth'{}_0\eth\big(\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big(S-\bar{S}\big)\Big(\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)} + {}_0\eth'{}_0\eth\big(\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}\big)\Big) + \\
&+ \lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(1)} + \lambda\lambda_1^{(0)}\Big\},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.20}
$$

where the irrelevant constants of integration have been chosen to be zero. Apart from the last two (ambiguous) terms in (5.20) (which have the structure of $F^{(-2)}$) all the terms are proportional to $\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)}$, which is essentially $F^{(-2)}$. Although $r^2F^{(-2)}$ has been given explicitly by (4.9), here we give another, and, from the points of view of later applications, a more useful expression.

Let us define the real (essentially the ${}_0Y_{1m}$ spherical harmonic) functions

$$
t^1 = \frac{\zeta+\bar{\zeta}}{1+\zeta\bar{\zeta}}, \qquad t^2 = \mathrm{i}\frac{\bar{\zeta}-\zeta}{1+\zeta\bar{\zeta}}, \qquad t^3 = \frac{\zeta\bar{\zeta}-1}{1+\zeta\bar{\zeta}}, \tag{5.21}
$$

and introduce the coefficients

$$R_1 := \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Big({}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi}a, \tag{5.22}$$

$$R_2 := -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Big({}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi}b, \tag{5.23}$$

$$R_3 := \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Big({}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi}c, \tag{5.24}$$

$$R_0 := \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Big({}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi}d; \tag{5.25}$$

which are constant by our requirement imposed at the end of the previous subsection. Here the second equalities hold if the reality condition (4.10) is imposed, and hence d is determined up to sign by the parameters in $R_{\mathbf{i}}$, $\mathbf{i} = 1,2,3$, as $d^2 = a^2 + b^2 + c^2$, i.e. formally $(R_0, R_{\mathbf{i}})$ is a real null vector with respect to the constant Lorentzian metric. Then a simple calculation gives

$$\lambda_0^{(0)}\lambda_1^{(0)} = \sqrt{2}\Big(R_0 + R_{\mathbf{i}}t^{\mathbf{i}}\Big), \tag{5.26}$$

yielding a parameterization of $F^{(-2)}$ and $F^{(-1)}$ in terms of $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ and R_0:

$$F^{(-2)} = \mp\, 2\Big(R_0 + R_{\mathbf{i}}t^{\mathbf{i}}\Big), \tag{5.27}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(-1)} = &\mp\, 2\Big(\big({}_0\eth S\big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) + \big({}_0\eth'\bar{S}\big)\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big(S+\bar{S}\big)t^{\mathbf{i}}\Big)R_{\mathbf{i}} \mp \\ &\mp\, \big(S-\bar{S}\big)R_0 \mp 2\big(G_0 + G_{\mathbf{i}}t^{\mathbf{i}}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

where the last term of (5.28) comes from the last two ambiguous terms of (5.20) for some (in general complex) functions G_0 and $G_{\mathbf{i}}$ of u. Introducing the new notation $K^{\mathbf{i}}_a := \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{i}}{}_{\mathbf{jk}}K^{\mathbf{jk}}_a$ for the Killing fields of the metric sphere of radius r and defining the antisymmetric matrix $M_{\mathbf{ij}}$ by $R_{\mathbf{i}} =: \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}{}^{\mathbf{jk}}M_{\mathbf{jk}}$, the leading-order term in rk_a can in fact be written as $K^{\mathbf{ij}}_a M_{\mathbf{ij}} = -2R_{\mathbf{i}}K^{\mathbf{i}}_a$, as it could be expected by (4.13). (Here raising and lowering of the boldface indices are defined by the *negative* definite constant metric $\eta_{\mathbf{ij}} := -\delta_{\mathbf{ij}}$.) The vector field rk^a itself is

$$\begin{aligned} \mp\, rk^a = 2\mathrm{i}\ \Big(&\ \bar{\hat{m}}^a\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) - \hat{m}^a\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big)R_{\mathbf{i}} + \\ +\frac{\mathrm{i}}{r}\ \Big(&\ \bar{\hat{m}}^a\Big[2\big({}_0\eth{}_0\eth'\bar{S}\big)\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) + {}_0\eth\big(\bar{S}-S\big)t^{\mathbf{i}} + \big(S+\bar{S}\big)\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big] - \\ &- \hat{m}^a\Big[2\big({}_0\eth'{}_0\eth S\big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) + {}_0\eth'\big(S-\bar{S}\big)t^{\mathbf{i}} + \big(S+\bar{S}\big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big]\Big)R_{\mathbf{i}} + \\ +\frac{\mathrm{i}}{r}\ \Big(&\ \bar{\hat{m}}^a{}_0\eth\big(S-\bar{S}\big) + \hat{m}^a{}_0\eth'\big(\bar{S}-S\big)\Big)R_0 + \\ +\frac{2\mathrm{i}}{r}\ \Big(&\ \bar{\hat{m}}^a\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) - \hat{m}^a\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big)G_{\mathbf{i}} + O]\big(r^{-2}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

One can see that the coefficients of $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ are real, but the coefficient of R_0 is *imaginary.* Consequently, in a general radiative spacetime (i.e. when the potential S for the asymptotic shear *cannot* be chosen to be real) the reality of the whole k^a *cannot* be ensured, even if $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $G_{\mathbf{i}}$ are chosen to be real. Indeed, the vanishing of R_0 is equivalent to $d = 0$, which would imply $a = b = c = 0$, too. Next recall that if $\xi^1 := -(1 - \zeta^2)$, $\xi^2 := -\mathrm{i}(1 + \zeta^2)$ and $\xi^3 := -2\zeta$, then the general BMS vector field has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{K}^a &= \Big(H + \big(c_{\mathbf{i}} + \bar{c}_{\mathbf{i}}\big)t^{\mathbf{i}}u\Big)\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\big)^a + c_{\mathbf{i}}\xi^{\mathbf{i}}\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta}\big)^a + \bar{c}_{\mathbf{i}}\bar{\xi}^{\mathbf{i}}\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\zeta}}\big)^a = \\ &= \Big(H + \big(c_{\mathbf{i}} + \bar{c}_{\mathbf{i}}\big)t^{\mathbf{i}}u\Big)\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\big)^a - 2\bar{c}_{\mathbf{i}}\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\hat{m}^a - 2c_{\mathbf{i}}\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\hat{\bar{m}}^a, \qquad (5.30)\end{aligned}$$

where $H = H(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ is an arbitrary real function and $c_{\mathbf{i}}$ are complex constants. This is a rotation BMS vector field tangent to the $u =$ const cut if $H = 0$ and the constants $c_{\mathbf{i}}$ are purely imaginary $c_{\mathbf{i}} = \mathrm{i}R_{\mathbf{i}}$. Therefore, taking the real part of rk^a, we have three independent real divergence free vector fields that are rotation BMS fields at the future null infinity, and, conversely, every rotation BMS vector field determines a vector field rk^a. Thus in the asymptotically flat context the role of the eigenvalue equation for the lowest eigenvalue is the unique extension of the BMS rotation vector fields off the future null infinity into a neighbourhood of the future null infinity. In addition, taking the imaginary part of rk^a we have one divergence free vector field that is asymptotically vanishing as $1/r$. However, the parameterization of the latter is fixed by those of the real part of rk^a. All the ambiguities in rk_a (including the addition of 'gauge solutions') can be written as $rk_a \mapsto rk_a + \frac{1}{r}G'_{\mathbf{i}}K^{\mathbf{i}}_a$ for some free (in general complex) *functions* $G'_{\mathbf{i}}$ of u.

5.3.2 The vector field $z^{\underline{a}}_{-}$

Since the vector field $z^{\underline{a}}_{-}$ is real, the function $F = r^2F^{(-2)} + rF^{(-1)} + O(1)$, for which $rz^{\underline{a}}_{-} = \varepsilon^{ab}\delta_b F$, can also be chosen to be real. Following the strategy of the previous subsection we can determine the explicit form of the components of $z^{\underline{a}}_{-}$ in terms of the components of the spinor fields λ_A and $\bar{\mu}_{A'}$, and comparing them with the defining equation for F, we obtain a system of differential equations for $F^{(-2)}$ and $F^{(-1)}$. Apart from the gauge terms, the solution will be an expression of

$$\lambda^{(0)}_1\big({}_0\eth\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}_{0'}\big) - \lambda^{(0)}_0\big({}_0\eth'\bar{\lambda}^{(0)}_{1'}\big) = R_0 + \mathrm{i}R_{\mathbf{i}}t^{\mathbf{i}}, \qquad (5.31)$$

where now the constants R_0 and $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ are real and are given by

$$R_0 := -\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Bigl({}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigr), \tag{5.32}$$

$$R_1 := \frac{\mathrm{i}}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Bigl({}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigr), \tag{5.33}$$

$$R_2 := \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Bigl({}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigr), \tag{5.34}$$

$$R_3 := \frac{\mathrm{i}}{4\sqrt{2}\pi}\Bigl({}_{(0)}c_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + {}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}\bar{c}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} - {}_{(0)}c_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\,{}_{(0)}\bar{c}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigr). \tag{5.35}$$

Note that R_0 is independent of the $R_{\mathbf{i}}$, in contrast to R_0 and $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ of (5.22)-(5.25). In terms of (5.31) the functions $F^{(-2)}$ and $F^{(-1)}$ take the simple, explicit form

$$F^{(-2)} = -\,2t^{\mathbf{i}}R_{\mathbf{i}}, \tag{5.36}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(-1)} = &-\,2\Bigl(\bigl({}_0\eth S\bigr)\bigl({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\bigr) + \bigl({}_0\eth'\bar{S}\bigr)\bigl({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\bigr) + \frac{1}{2}\bigl(S+\bar{S}\bigr)t^{\mathbf{i}}\Bigr)R_{\mathbf{i}} + \\ &+ \mathrm{i}\bigl(S-\bar{S}\bigr)R_0 - 2t^{\mathbf{i}}G_{\mathbf{i}}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

where the last term represents the ambiguity coming from the gauge solutions in the eigenspinor components $\lambda^{(1)}_{\underline{A}}$; and, for the sake of simplicity, the irrelevant constants of integration have been chosen to be zero. Comparing (5.36), (5.37) with (5.27), (5.28) we see that, apart from constants and the ± sign, the coefficients of $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ coincide, and the imaginary part of (5.28) (i.e. the coefficient of R_0) is just the coefficient of the independent parameter R_0 in (5.37). Therefore, the corresponding vector fields coincide: the vector fields $rz^{\underline{a}}_{-}$ parameterized by $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ are just the real part of the vector fields rk^a, and the asymptotically vanishing vector field, parameterized by R_0, is just the imaginary part of rk^a of the previous subsection.

5.4 2-surface observables at $\mathscr{I}^+$

5.4.1 The observable $O[N^a]$

In [8] we showed that (1) the basic Hamiltonian of vacuum general relativity on a compact 3-manifold Σ with smooth 2-boundary $\mathcal{S}$ is functionally differentiable with respect to the ADM canonical variables if the area 2-form is fixed on $\mathcal{S}$, the lapse function is vanishing on $\mathcal{S}$, and the shift vector N^a is tangent to $\mathcal{S}$ and divergence free with respect to the connection δ_e; (2) the evolution equations preserve these boundary conditions; (3) the basic Hamiltonians form a closed Poisson algebra $\mathcal{H}_0$, in which the constraints form an ideal $\mathcal{C}$; (4) the value of the basic Hamiltonian on the constraint surface, given explicitly by the integral

$$O\bigl[N^a\bigr] := -\frac{1}{8\pi G}\oint_{\mathcal{S}} N^e A_e \mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}, \tag{5.38}$$

is a well defined, 2+2 covariant, gauge invariant observable; and (5) this O provides a Lie algebra (anti-)homomorphism of the Lie algebra of the δ_e-divergence-free vector fields on $\mathcal{S}$ into the quotient Lie algebra $\mathcal{H}_0/\mathcal{C}$ of observables. However, it should be noted that, independently of the quasi-local canonical analysis above, (5.38) already had appeared as a suggestion for the angular momentum of black hole horizons [30, 31, 32].

We also considered the limit of this observable when the 2-surface $\mathcal{S}$ tends to the spatial or the future null infinity. We showed that from the requirement of the finiteness of the limit at spatial infinity it follows that N^a is necessarily a combination of the asymptotic rotation Killing vectors, and hence the corresponding observable is just the familiar expression of spatial angular momentum there. Unfortunately, however, at null infinity the general expression still contains a huge ambiguity. In fact, if the function ν defined by $N^a = \varepsilon^{ab}\delta_b\nu$ is written as $\nu = r^2\nu^{(-2)} + r\nu^{(-1)} + O(1)$, then the $r \to \infty$ limit of $O[N^a]$ is finite precisely when $\nu^{(-2)}$ is a linear combination of the first four (i.e. $j = 0$ and 1) ordinary spherical harmonics. In this case N^a tends to a rotation BMS vector field, and for the observable $O[N^a]$, associated with a large sphere $\mathcal{S}_r$ of radius r, we obtain

$$O\bigl[N^a\bigr] = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{8\pi G}\oint\Bigl(\bigl(\psi^0_1 + \sigma^0{}_0\eth\bar\sigma^0\bigr)\bigl({}_0\eth'\nu^{(-2)}\bigr) - \bigl(\bar\psi^0_1 + \bar\sigma^0{}_0\eth'\sigma^0\bigr)\bigl({}_0\eth\nu^{(-2)}\bigr) + \\ + \sigma^0\bigl({}_0\eth'^2\nu^{(-1)}\bigr) - \bar\sigma^0\bigl({}_0\eth^2\nu^{(-1)}\bigr)\Bigr)\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}_1 + O\bigl(r^{-1}\bigr), \qquad (5.39)$$

where $\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}_1$ is the area element on the *unit* sphere. (In [8] $\nu^{(-2)}$ and $\nu^{(-1)}$ were denoted by $\nu^{(2)}$ and $\nu^{(1)}$, respectively.) Though this formula reduces to the standard expression of angular momentum for stationary systems (when the potential S for the asymptotic shear can be chosen to be real), in general spacetimes this is still ambiguous unless the function $\nu^{(-1)}$ has been specified. Or, in other words, the limit of $O[N^a]$ at the null infinity depends also on the way how the vector field N^a tends to the rotation BMS vector field leaving the cut in question fixed. Thus to have a well defined angular momentum expression in a general, radiative spacetime within the framework defined by the observable $O[N^a]$, a prescription for $\nu^{(-1)}$ is needed.

5.4.2 Spectral angular momentum and a measure of the magnetic part of the asymptotic shear at $\mathscr{I}^+$

The aim of the present subsection is to use the asymptotic rotation Killing fields rk^a and $rz^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\ }}$ as the vector field N^a and to calculate the $r \to \infty$ limit of the corresponding observable, hoping to obtain a reasonable definition of spatial angular momentum even in the presence of outgoing gravitational radiation. One way of doing this might be based on the observation that $N^aA_a = N^am_a(\bar\beta - \beta') + N^a\bar m_a(\beta - \bar\beta') = N_{01'}\bar\tau + N_{10'}\tau$. Substituting the components of the vector field and the asymptotic form of the spin coefficient τ here, a rather lengthy calculation gives the desired expression.

However, a much more economic method (and we adopt it here) is to use (5.39) by writing $\nu = F$ if N^a is rk^a or rz^a_-. Since only the *second* ${}_0\eth$ and ${}_0\eth'$ derivatives of $\nu^{(-1)}$ appear in (5.39), all the ambiguities are canceled from $\lim_{r\to\infty} O[N^a]$, i.e. *the observable* $\lim_{r\to\infty} O[N^a]$ *is well defined and does not depend on the gauge ambiguities of the solution* $\lambda^{(1)}_{\underline{A}}$. Thus, for the sake of simplicity, the ambiguous terms in (5.28) and (5.37) can be chosen to be zero: $G_0 = 0$ and $G_{\mathbf{i}} = 0$.

To determine the explicit form of the observable $\lim_{r\to\infty} O[N^a]$, recall that the functions $\nu^{(-2)}$ and $\nu^{(-1)}$ are linear functions of the parameters $R_{\mathbf{i}}$ and R_0. Therefore, the $r \to \infty$ limit of the observables $O[rk^a]$ and $O[rz^a_-]$ have the structure

$$\pm\frac{1}{2}\lim_{r\to\infty} O\big[rk^a\big] =: R_{\mathbf{i}}\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}} + \mathrm{i}R_0\mathtt{M}, \tag{5.40}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\lim_{r\to\infty} O\big[rz^a_-\big] =: R_{\mathbf{i}}\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}} + R_0\mathtt{M}, \tag{5.41}$$

respectively. From the actual form of $F^{(-1)}$ it follows that $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ and $\mathtt{M}$ are real. Recalling that the vector fields rk^a and rz^a_- tend (or can be chosen to tend) asymptotically to the combination $-2R_{\mathbf{i}}K^{\mathbf{i}}_a$ of the rotation Killing fields of the metric sphere of radius r with *real* $R_{\mathbf{i}}$, which have in fact unique extension to real BMS vector fields tangent to the $u = \text{const}$ cut of $\mathscr{I}^+$, the observable $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ may be interpreted as the spatial angular momentum associated with the $u = \text{const}$ cut of the future null infinity. Remarkably enough, *the vector fields* rk^a *and* rz^a_- *define the same observables* $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ *and* $\mathtt{M}$, i.e. the $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$'s and the $\mathtt{M}$'s in equations (5.40) and (5.41) *coincide.*

The explicit form of $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}} = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{8\pi G}\oint\Big\{\ &\Big(\psi^0_1 + 2\sigma^0\,{}_0\eth\bar\sigma^0\Big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) - \Big(\bar\psi^0_1 + 2\bar\sigma^0\,{}_0\eth'\sigma^0\Big)\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) + \\ &+ \sigma^0\Big({}_0\eth\big({}_0\eth'^2 S\big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big({}_0\eth'^2 S\big)t^{\mathbf{i}}\Big) - \\ &- \bar\sigma^0\Big({}_0\eth'\big({}_0\eth^2\bar S\big)\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big({}_0\eth^2\bar S\big)t^{\mathbf{i}}\Big)\Big\}\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}_1.\end{aligned} \tag{5.42}$$

It could be interesting to note that the first line gives just the spatial part of Bramson's angular momentum expression [33]: in fact, taking into account that ${}_0\eth(\sigma^0\bar\sigma^0)({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}) = {}_0\eth(\sigma^0\bar\sigma^0\,{}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}) + \sigma^0\bar\sigma^0 t^{\mathbf{i}}$, the first line of the integrand can be written as the imaginary part of $(\psi^0_1 + 2\sigma^0\,{}_0\eth\bar\sigma^0 + {}_0\eth(\sigma^0\bar\sigma^0))({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}})$. Therefore, the whole $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ can be interpreted as Bramson's angular momentum plus some 'correction terms' built from the potential S in a gauge invariant way.

Apart from the Weyl spinor component ψ^0_1 all the terms of the integrand in (5.42) can be written into the form of a bilinear expression of the real and the imaginary parts of the potential S. In fact, a trivial calculation gives that the terms in the integrand of (5.42) containing $t^{\mathbf{i}}$ algebraically can be written as

$$\frac{1}{4}\Big({}_0\eth^2(S+\bar S){}_0\eth'^2(S-\bar S)+{}_0\eth'^2(S+\bar S){}_0\eth^2(S-\bar S)\Big)t^{\mathbf{i}};$$

while the remaining terms containing the asymptotic shear as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4}\Big\{\Big(3{}_0\eth^2(S+\bar S){}_0\eth{}_0\eth'^2(S+\bar S)-{}_0\eth^2(S-\bar S){}_0\eth{}_0\eth'^2(S-\bar S)\Big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)-\\
&\quad-\Big(3{}_0\eth'^2(S+\bar S){}_0\eth'{}_0\eth^2(S+\bar S)-{}_0\eth'^2(S-\bar S){}_0\eth'{}_0\eth^2(S-\bar S)\Big)\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big\}+\\
&+\frac{1}{4}\Big\{\Big(3{}_0\eth^2(S-\bar S){}_0\eth{}_0\eth'^2(S+\bar S)-{}_0\eth^2(S+\bar S){}_0\eth{}_0\eth'^2(S-\bar S)\Big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)+\\
&\quad+\Big(3{}_0\eth'^2(S-\bar S){}_0\eth'{}_0\eth^2(S+\bar S)-{}_0\eth'^2(S+\bar S){}_0\eth'{}_0\eth^2(S-\bar S)\Big)\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big\}
\end{aligned}\tag{5.43}$$

However, the first two lines of (5.43), i.e. the terms quadratic in $(S+\bar S)$ and in $(S-\bar S)$, can be written into a total divergence. Indeed, by taking total derivatives and using the commutator of the edth operators, for any function f we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\big({}_0\eth^2 f\big){}_0\eth\big({}_0\eth'^2 f\big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big) &= {}_0\eth\Big(\big({}_0\eth f\big){}_0\eth\big({}_0\eth'^2 f\big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)+\frac{1}{2}\big({}_0\eth{}_0\eth' f\big)^2\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big)+\\
&+{}_0\eth'\Big(\big({}_0\eth f\big)\big({}_0\eth{}_0\eth' f\big)t^{\mathbf{i}}-\big({}_0\eth f\big){}_0\eth'\big({}_0\eth^2 f\big)\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big)+\\
&+\Big(\big({}_0\eth f\big)\big({}_0\eth' f\big)-\frac{1}{2}\big({}_0\eth{}_0\eth' f\big)^2\Big)t^{\mathbf{i}},
\end{aligned}$$

implying that $({}_0\eth^2 f){}_0\eth({}_0\eth'^2 f)({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}})-({}_0\eth'^2 f){}_0\eth'({}_0\eth^2 f)({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}})$ is a total divergence. Applying this to $f=S+\bar S$ and to $f=S-\bar S$ in (5.43) we finally obtain that the first two lines in (5.43) do, indeed, form a total divergence. This implies, in particular, that in stationary spacetimes, when S is real (see [34]), $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ reduces to the standard expression [35]

$$\frac{\mathrm{i}}{8\pi G}\oint\Big(\psi^0_1\big({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)-\bar\psi^0_1\big({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\big)\Big)\mathrm{d}S_1.$$

We also note that in axi-symmetric spacetime with Killing vector K^a the observable $O[K^a]$ on axi-symmetric surfaces is just the Komar expression [8]. We call the $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ given by (5.42) the *spectral angular momentum* at $\mathscr{I}^+$.

The explicit form of the other observable $\mathtt{M}$ is

$$\mathtt{M}=\frac{1}{16\pi G}\oint\Big(2\sigma^0\bar\sigma^0-\big({}_0\eth'^2\bar S\big)\big({}_0\eth^2\bar S\big)-\big({}_0\eth'^2 S\big)\big({}_0\eth^2 S\big)\Big)\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}_1.\tag{5.44}$$

Clearly, this is real and is vanishing for purely electric σ^0, i.e. when S is real. However, this is, in fact, *non-negative and zero precisely for purely electric asymptotic shear*; i.e. it defines a measure of the presence of the magnetic part of the asymptotic shear. To see this, let us rewrite its integrand (by integration by parts and by using ${}_0\eth^2{}_0\eth'^2S={}_0\eth'^2{}_0\eth^2S$) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigl({}_0\eth^2S\bigr){}_0\eth'^2\bigl(\bar S-S\bigr)+\bigl({}_0\eth'^2\bar S\bigr){}_0\eth^2\bigl(S-\bar S\bigr)\simeq\\
\simeq\;&\bigl({}_0\eth'^2{}_0\eth^2S\bigr)\bigl(\bar S-S\bigr)+\bigl({}_0\eth'^2\bar S\bigr){}_0\eth^2\bigl(S-\bar S\bigr)=\\
=\;&\bigl({}_0\eth^2{}_0\eth'^2S\bigr)\bigl(\bar S-S\bigr)+\bigl({}_0\eth'^2\bar S\bigr){}_0\eth^2\bigl(S-\bar S\bigr)\simeq\\
\simeq\;&\Bigl({}_0\eth'^2\bigl(\bar S-S\bigr)\Bigr)\Bigl({}_0\eth^2\bigl(S-\bar S\bigr)\Bigr),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\simeq$ means ‘equal up to total divergences’. Since in stationary spacetimes (and hence in the absence of outgoing gravitational radiation) the asymptotic shear is always purely electric [34], the non-vanishing of $\mathtt{M}$ indicates non-trivial dynamics of the gravitational field near the future null infinity.

From (5.42) and (5.44) it is clear that both $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ and $\mathtt{M}$ are well defined in the sense that they depend only on the cut of $\mathscr{I}^+$. In particular, they do *not* depend on the choice of the origin of u, and hence $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ is free of supertranslation ambiguities. The notion of spectral angular momentum is based on the solution of a certain elliptic equation on the cut rather than on the BMS vector fields. The latter is used only to *interpret* $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ as spatial angular momentum. On the other hand, since the vector field N^e in the observable $O[N^e]$ must be tangent to the 2-surface, in the theoretical framework based on $O[N^e]$ we cannot ask for the effect of (any form of) translations or boosts. Thus the spectral angular momentum $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ should probably be interpreted only as the *spin part* of the (as yet not known) total *relativistic* angular momentum.

5.4.3 Comparison of angular momenta on different cuts

In the previous subsection, we saw that $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ is unambiguously associated with any cut of $\mathscr{I}^+$. In the present subsection, we ask how the angular momenta associated with two *different* cuts of $\mathscr{I}^+$, say $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\tilde{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$, can be compared. First we discuss the theoretical basis of this comparison, and then we derive the formula for the flux of spectral angular momentum carried away by the outgoing gravitational radiation in Einstein–Maxwell spacetimes. (The hat over a symbol is referring to the unphysical spacetime, indicating that that may be ill-defined in the physical spacetime.)

Mathematically $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ is an element of the dual of the space $\mathcal{R}$ of the rotation BMS vector fields that are tangent to $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. Hence the spectral angular momenta on the cuts $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\tilde{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$ can be compared only if we can find a natural isomorphism $I:\mathcal{R}\to\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, yielding the identification of the corresponding dual spaces as well. Formally, this isomorphism is analogous to that we already discussed in a nutshell at the end of subsection 5.2 in a slightly different context. Thus, let us fix the Bondi conformal gauge on $\mathscr{I}^+$, and hence both $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\tilde{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$ inherit the unit sphere metric, and let $\hat n^a$ be the future pointing tangent of the null geodesic generators of $\mathscr{I}^+$ such that $\hat n_a=-\hat\nabla_a\Omega|_{\mathscr{I}^+}$. The spinor constituent $\hat\iota^A$ of $\hat n^A$

can be chosen to be constant along the generators: $\hat{n}^a\hat{\nabla}_a\hat{\iota}^B = 0$, and fix its phase. Then the spinor $\hat{\iota}^A$ can be completed to a spin frame $\{\hat{o}^A, \hat{\iota}^A\}$ at the points of the cuts $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\tilde{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$ such that the complex null vectors $\hat{m}^a := \hat{o}^A\bar{\hat{\iota}}^{A'}$ and $\bar{\hat{m}}^a := \hat{\iota}^A\bar{\hat{o}}^{A'}$ are tangent to the surfaces. This $\hat{o}^A$ is uniquely determined by the cuts, and hence we have a uniquely determined complex null basis $\{\hat{m}^a, \bar{\hat{m}}^a\}$ on both $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\tilde{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$. (If the cuts intersect each other, then, of course, the spinors $\hat{o}^A$ at the points of intersection do not coincide unless the cuts are tangent to each other there.) In addition, if we fix a complex stereographic coordinate system $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ on one of the cuts, then by the condition $\hat{n}^a\hat{\nabla}_a\zeta = 0$ this determines a complex stereographic coordinate system on the other cut (and, in fact, on the whole $\mathscr{I}^+$) in a unique way. But then, recalling the structure (5.30) of the rotation BMS vector fields, we have an isomorphism $I : \mathcal{R} \to \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$: the vector field $\hat{K}^a_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ is identified with $\hat{K}^a_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ via I precisely when their components $c_{\mathbf{i}}$ coincide. It is this isomorphism by means of which we identify the dual spaces $\mathcal{R}^*$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^*$ with each other, and one can subtract $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ from $\tilde{\mathtt{J}}^{\mathbf{i}}$ directly. Thus we are ready to calculate how $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ changes from cut to cut.

Thus let u be the Bondi time coordinate whose origin is chosen to be $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$, introduce the 1-parameter family of cuts $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_u$ obtained from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ by BMS time translations along $\hat{n}^a$, denote the spectral angular momentum on $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_u$ by $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}(u)$, and calculate its derivative with respect to u at $u = 0$. If, for the sake of brevity, we write the integrand of $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ as $(\psi^0_1 + F)_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}} - (\bar{\psi}^0_1 + \bar{F})_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}$ (by using ${}_0\eth_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}} = {}_0\eth'{}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}} = -t^{\mathbf{i}}$), then by (5.1) and (5.3) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathtt{J}}^{\mathbf{i}} = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{8\pi G}\oint\Bigl(&4\ G\ \bigl(\varphi^0_1\bar{\varphi}^0_2\bigl({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\bigr) - \varphi^0_2\bar{\varphi}^0_1\bigl({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\bigr)\bigr) + \\ &+ t^{\mathbf{i}}\ \bigl(\bar{\sigma}^0\dot{\sigma}^0 + 2{}_0\eth'\bigl(\sigma^0{}_0\eth\dot{\bar{\sigma}}^0\bigr) - {}_0\eth'\dot{F}\bigr) - \\ &- t^{\mathbf{i}}\ \bigl(\sigma^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}^0 + 2{}_0\eth\bigl(\bar{\sigma}^0{}_0\eth'\dot{\sigma}^0\bigr) - {}_0\eth\dot{\bar{F}}\bigr)\Bigr)\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}_1. \end{aligned} \qquad (5.45)$$

The first line is just the angular momentum flux carried away by the electromagnetic radiation, while the remaining terms can be interpreted as that carried away by the gravitational waves. In fact, the first two terms can also be written as

$$\Phi^{\mathbf{i}} := \frac{1}{8\pi}\lim_{r\to\infty}\oint_{\mathcal{S}_r} n^a T_{ab} 2\mathrm{i}\Bigl(\hat{m}^b\bigl({}_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}\bigr) - \bar{\hat{m}}^b\bigl({}_0\eth t^{\mathbf{i}}\bigr)\Bigr)\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}_r,$$

where $T_{ab} = 2\varphi_{AB}\bar{\varphi}_{A'B'}$, the energy-momentum tensor of the Maxwell field. Recalling the form (5.30) of the rotation BMS vector field, $\Phi^{\mathbf{i}}du$ is just the angular momentum current carried away by the electromagnetic radiation between the u and $u + du$ retarded times.

Moreover, recall that by (5.2) the time derivative of the Bondi–Sachs energy-momentum, $\mathtt{P}^{\underline{a}} := -\frac{1}{4\pi G}\oint(\psi^0_2 + \sigma^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}^0)t^{\underline{a}}\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{S}_1$, is the integral of $-\frac{1}{4\pi G}(\dot{\sigma}^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}^0 + 2G\varphi^0_2\bar{\varphi}^0_2)t^{\underline{a}}$, where $t^{\underline{a}} := (1, t^{\mathbf{i}})$ (see e.g. [34, 27, 6]). Thus the vanishing of the outgoing energy flux is equivalent to $\dot{\sigma}^0 = 0$ and $\varphi^0_2 = 0$. Clearly, if $\dot{\sigma}^0 = 0$, then the corresponding shear potential is also time independent: $\dot{S} = 0$. Then, however, equation (5.45) shows, in particular, that *in the absence of outgoing energy flux the outgoing spectral angular momentum flux is also vanishing.* Obviously, every angular momentum expression shares this property which can be written as the integral of the imaginary part of $(\psi^0_1 + F)_0\eth' t^{\mathbf{i}}$ with some gauge invariant expression F of S and $\bar{S}$.

Although we could consider a more general family of cuts obtained from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ by a general *supertranslation* along $H\hat{n}^a$ with a general $H = H(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, but the resulting formula does not seem to yield much deeper understanding of gravitational radiation. Technically, the use of such a more general foliation of $\mathscr{I}^+$ yields only that the $\hat{o}^A$ spinor of the spin frame adapted to the foliation undergoes the special null rotation $\hat{o}^A \mapsto \hat{o}^A + ({}_0\eth H)\hat{\iota}^A$, and the u-derivatives $\dot{\psi}^0_1$ and $\dot{\sigma}^0$ have to be substituted by $H\dot{\psi}^0_1 + 3({}_0\eth H)\psi^0_2$ and $H\dot{\sigma}^0 - {}_0\eth^2 H$, respectively.

The ultimate answer whether or not the spectral angular momentum and the observable `M` have physical significance will be given by the practice. In particular, it could be interesting to see whether or not the inequalities like in [36, 37] can be proven for $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ too, or whether in the unified model of spatial and null infinity [38] the $u \to -\infty$ limit of $\mathtt{J}^{\mathbf{i}}$ reduces to the ADM angular momentum.

6 Appendix

6.1 Hermitian fibre metrics on the spinor bundle

Clearly, any Hermitian fibre metric $G_{AA'}$ on $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$ can also be considered as a *real* section G_a of the (dual) Lorentzian vector bundle $\mathbb{V}_a(\mathcal{S})$, defined to be the pull back to $\mathcal{S}$ of the spacetime cotangent bundle T^*M. This $G_{AA'}$ is positive definite (and hence nonsingular) iff it is future pointing and timelike in $\mathbb{V}_a(\mathcal{S})$. Such a metric can be specified by four real functions on $\mathcal{S}$.

Next introduce the inverse $G^{AA'}$ of $G_{AA'}$ by $G^{AA'}G_{BA'} = \delta^A_B$. Then from $(\varepsilon^{AB}\varepsilon^{A'B'}G_{BB'})G_{CA'} = \frac{1}{2}\delta^A_C G_e G_f g^{ef}$ we see that the inverse $G^{AA'}$ is just the contravariant form of $G_{AA'}$, i.e. $G^{AA'} = \varepsilon^{AB}\varepsilon^{A'B'}G_{BB'}$ (or, equivalently, the symplectic and the Hermitian metrics are compatible in the sense that $\varepsilon^{AB}G_{AA'}G_{BB'} = \varepsilon_{A'B'}$) iff $G_a G_b g^{ab} = 2$. This normalization reduces the independent components of $G_{AA'}$ to three. However, such a fibre metric can be specialized further by requiring its compatibility with the chirality: $G_{AA'}\gamma^A{}_B\bar{\gamma}^{A'}{}_{B'} = G_{BB'}$. Since $\gamma^A{}_B\bar{\gamma}^{A'}{}_{B'}$, as a base-point preserving bundle map $\mathbb{V}_a(\mathcal{S}) \to \mathbb{V}_a(\mathcal{S})$ acts as identity precisely on sections orthogonal to $\mathcal{S}$ (and as minus the identity precisely on sections tangent to $\mathcal{S}$), this compatibility is equivalent to the orthogonality of G_a to $\mathcal{S}$. The independent components of such a metric is only one. In a fixed, normalized GHP spin frame $\{o^A, \iota^A\}$, adapted to $\mathcal{S}$, it has the general form $G_{AA'} = g o_A \bar{o}_{A'} + (1/g)\iota_A\bar{\iota}_{A'}$, where g is an arbitrary, strictly positive real function on $\mathcal{S}$. Note that for orientable $\mathcal{S}$ in a time and space orientable spacetime there is no obstruction to the global existence of such a $G_{AA'}$, because in this case the normal bundle of $\mathcal{S}$ in the spacetime is globally trivializable.

On general 2-surfaces there does not seem to be any natural choice for such a $G_{AA'}$, or, equivalently, for such a g. If, however, the 2-surface is mean-convex, i.e. when the dual mean curvature vector of $\mathcal{S}$ is timelike, then there is such a choice. In fact, the mean curvature vector $Q_b := Q^a_{ab} = -2(\rho' o_A \bar{o}_{A'} + \rho \iota_A \bar{\iota}_{A'})$ and its dual, $\tilde{Q}_b := {}^\perp\varepsilon_{ba} Q^a = 2(\rho' o_A \bar{o}_{A'} - \rho \iota_A \bar{\iota}_{A'})$, are globally defined and orthogonal to $\mathcal{S}$, furthermore $|Q|^2 := \tilde{Q}_a \tilde{Q}^a = -Q_a Q^a = -8\rho\rho'$. Then for mean convex surfaces either $\rho > 0$ and $\rho' < 0$ or $\rho < 0$ and $\rho' > 0$, and it is natural to define $G_{AA'} := \pm\sqrt{2}\tilde{Q}_{AA'}/|\tilde{Q}| = \pm(\rho' o_A \bar{o}_{A'} - \rho \iota_A \bar{\iota}_{A'})/\sqrt{|\rho\rho'|}$ with the sign yielding future pointing G^a.

6.2 Non-existence of constant Hermitian fibre metrics

We show that the existence of a positive definite Hermitian metric on the spinor bundle compatible with the covariant derivative operator δ_e is equivalent to the triviality of the holonomy of δ_e on the normal bundle.

Let $G_{AA'}$ be a Hermitian scalar product on the spinor bundle $\mathbb{S}^A(\mathcal{S})$ and assume that $\delta_e G_{AA'} = 0$. Considering this metric to be a Lorentzian vector field on $\mathcal{S}$, the integrability condition of $\delta_e G_{AA'} = 0$ is $0 = (\delta_c\delta_d - \delta_d\delta_c)G_b = G_a f^a{}_{bcd}$. Contracting this with the area 2-form ε^{cd} and taking into account the explicit expression for the curvature $f^a{}_{bcd}$ given in subsection 2.1, we obtain

$$\Big(R\varepsilon_{ab} - 2\varepsilon^{cd}\big(\delta_c A_d\big){}^\perp\varepsilon_{ab}\Big)G^b = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

This implies that δ_e admits a constant section of the vector bundle $\mathbb{V}_a(\mathcal{S})$ only if δ_e is flat. Restricting G_a to be normal to $\mathcal{S}$ we find in particular that δ_e admits a constant section of the normal bundle only if A_e is flat. (By (6.1) δ_e admits a constant section of the tangent bundle only if $(\mathcal{S}, q_{ab})$ is flat, which, by the Gauss–Bonnet theorem, can happen only if $\mathcal{S}$ is a torus.) Therefore, the necessary condition of the existence of a δ_e-constant positive definite Hermitian metric, being compatible with $\gamma^A{}_B$, is the flatness of the connection δ_e on the normal bundle. Then, however, the globality of G_a implies that the connection is holonomically trivial too. To see this, consider a closed curve $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{S}$ with the base point $p := \gamma(0) = \gamma(1)$, and suppose, on the contrary, that the holonomy $H_\gamma : N_p\mathcal{S} \to N_p\mathcal{S}$, as an element of the structure group $SO(1,1)$, is different from identity. Since G^a is globally defined on $\mathcal{S}$ and constant with respect to δ_e, the holonomy H_γ acts on G^a_p (the value of G^a at p) as the identity. Since the only element of $SO(1,1)$ leaving the nonzero vector G^a fixed is the identity, the holonomy H_γ is the identity, and hence the whole holonomy group at every point p, must be trivial.

Conversely, the triviality of the holonomy of the connection δ_e on the normal bundle and the global trivializability of $N\mathcal{S}$ imply the existence of a globally defined orthonormal δ_e-constant frame field $\{t^a, v^a\}$ with future pointing and timelike t^a. Then e.g. $G_{AA'} := \sqrt{2} t_{AA'}$ is a desired positive definite Hermitian scalar product on the spinor bundle.

The author is grateful to Jörg Frauendiener and Ted Newman for the useful discussions on the angular momentum at null infinity. This work was partially supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA) grants T042531 and K67790.

References

[1] J. Winicour, Angular momentum in general relativity, in *General Relativity and Gravitation*, Vol 2, pp 71–96, Ed. A. Held, Plenum Publishing Co, New York 1980

[2] L. B. Szabados, On certain quasi-local spin-angular momentum expressions for large spheres near the null infinity, Class. Quantum Grav. **18** 5487–5510 (2001), gr-qc/0109047

[3] O. M. Moreschi, Intrinsic angular momentum and centre of mass in general relativity, Class. Quantum Grav. **21** 5409–5425 (2004), gr-qc/0209097

[4] P. T. Chruściel, J. Jezierski, J. Kijowski, *A Hamiltonian Framework for Field Theories in the Radiative Regime*, Vol m70 of Lecture Notes in Physics, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York 2001

[5] L. B. Szabados, Quasi-local energy-momentum and angular momentum in GR: A review article, Living Rev. Relativity **7** (2004) 4

[6] R. Penrose, W. Rindler, *Spinors and Spacetime*, Vol 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1986

[7] A. D. Helfer, Angular momentum of isolated systems, Gen. Rel. Grav. (to be published), arXiv:0709.1078

[8] L. B. Szabados, On a class of 2-surface observables in general relativity, Class. Quantum Grav. **23** 2291–2302 (2006), gr-qc/0511059

[9] G. B. Cook, B. F. Whiting, Approximate Killing vectors on S^2, Phys. Rev. D **76** 041501(R) (2007), arXiv:0706.0199

[10] M. Engman, R. Cordero-Soto, Intrinsic spectral geometry of the Kerr–Newman event horizon, J. Math. Phys. **47** 033503-1–6 (2005), math-ph/0509067

[11] Th. Friedrich, Der erste Eigenwert des Dirac-operators einer kompakten Riemannschen Mannigfaltigkeit nichtnegativer Skalarkrümmung, Math. Nachr. **97** 117–146 (1980)

[12] O. Hijazi, A conformal lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Dirac operator and Killing spinors, Commun. Math. Phys. **104** 151–162 (1986)

[13] O. Hijazi, Lower bounds for the eigenvalues of the Dirac operator, J. Geom. Phys. **16** 27–38 (1995)

[14] Th. Friedrich, *Dirac Operators in Riemannian Geometry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol 25, AMS Providence, Rhode Island 2000

[15] C. Bär, Lower eigenvalue estimates for Dirac operators, Math. Ann. **293** 39–46 (1992)

[16] Th. Friedrich, E. C. Kim, Some remarks on the Hijazi inequality and generalizations of the Killing equation for spinors, J. Geom. Phys. **37** 1–14 (2001)

[17] X. Zhang, Lower bounds for eigenvalues of hypersurface Dirac operators, Math. Res. Lett. **5** 199–210 (1998)

[18] L. B. Szabados, Two dimensional Sen connections in general relativity, Class. Quantum Grav. **11** 1833–1846 (1994), gr-qc/9402001

[19] A. Lichnerowicz, Spineurs harmoniques, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris A–B **257** 7–9 (1963)

[20] R. Penrose, W. Rindler, *Spinors and Spacetime*, Vol 1, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1984

[21] R. Geroch, A. Held, R. Penrose, A space-time calculus based on pairs of null directions, J. Math. Phys. **14** 874–881 (1973)

[22] J. Frauendiener, L. B. Szabados, The kernel of the edth operators on higher-genus spacelike 2-surfaces, Class. Quantum Grav. **18** 1003–1014 (2001), gr-qc/0010089

[23] G. Horowitz, K. P. Tod, A relation between local and total energy in general relativity, Commun. Math. Phys. **85** 429–447 (1982)

[24] L. B. Szabados, Two dimensional Sen connections and quasi-local energy-momentum, Class. Quantum Grav. **11** 1847–1866 (1994), gr-qc/9402005

[25] E. Witten, A new proof of the positive energy theorem, Commun. Math. Phys. **30** 381–402 (1981)

[26] J. M. Nester, A new gravitational energy expression and with a simple positivity proof, Phys. Lett. A, **83** 241–242 (1981)

[27] E. T. Newman, K. P. Tod, Asymptotically flat spacetimes, in *General Relativity and Gravitation*, Ed. A. Held, Vol 2, pp 1–36, Plenum Press, New York 1980

[28] W. T. Shaw, The asymptopia of quasi-local mass and momentum: I. General formalism and stationary spacetimes, Class. Quantum Grav. **3** 1069–1104 (1986)

[29] J. Stewart, *Advanced General Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990

[30] A. Ashtekar, B. Krishnan, Dynamical horizons and their properties, Phys. Rev. D **68** 104030–1-25 (2003), gr-qc/0308033

[31] I. Booth, S. Fairhurst, Horizon energy and angular momentum from a Hamiltonian perspective, Class. Quantum Grav. **22** 4515–4550 (2005), gr-qc/0505049

[32] E. Gourgoulhon, Generalized Damour–Navier–Stokes equations applied to trapping horizons, Phys. Rev. D **72** 104007–1-16 (2005), gr-qc/0508003

[33] B. D. Bramson, Relativistic angular momentum for asymptotically flat Einstein–Maxwell manifolds, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A, **341** 463–490 (1975)

[34] E. T. Newman, R. Penrose, New conservation laws for zero rest-mass fields in asymptotically flat spacetimes, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, **305** 175–204 (1968)

[35] B. D. Bramson, The invariance of spin, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A, **364** 383–392 (1978)

[36] P. T. Chruściel, K. P. Tod, An angular momentum bound at null infinity, arXiv:0706.4057

[37] S. Dain, The inequality between mass and angular momentum for axially symmetric black holes, arXiv:0707.3118

[38] H. Friedrich, Gravitational fields near space-like and null infinity, J. Geom. Phys. **24** 83–163 (1998)